Tools for Schools

National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students

From At-Risk to Excellence

National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students

Tools for Schools

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education

Tools for Schools:

School Reform Models Supported by the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education

U.S. Department of Education
Richard W. Riley
Secretary

Office of Educational Research and Improvement
Ricky T. Takai
Acting Assistant Secretary

National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students
Edward J. Fuentes
Director

Media and Information Services
Cynthia Hearn Dorfman
Director

April 1998

Editors
Susan Talley and D. Hollinger Martinez

This publication is based on abstracts submitted by the various project directors of research programs funded by the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. This document does not necessarily reflect the views of the Department nor any agency of the U.S. Government.

Preface

The 27 school reform models presented in this publication have been supported, at some time in their development and dissemination, by the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students in the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. As part of its mission, the Institute supports the development of research-based knowledge and strategies promoting excellence and equity in the education of children and youth placed at risk of educational failure. The Institute supports a coordinated and comprehensive program of educational research primarily through national research and development centers, multi-year contracts, and a field-initiated studies program. This publication represents the compilation of information about 27 school reform models that have received support for development, expansion, adaptation, or evaluation through the Institute's research program.

The primary purpose of this publication is to provide information to practitioners and policy makers who have decision-making authority for improving the performance of schools with significant at-risk student populations. It is not the Institute's intent to endorse or promote any of the models described here but merely to provide information. There are many other promising school reform models not covered in this publication, for the reason that they at no time received funding from this Institute. Additionally, there may be models that have received support from the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students but were inadvertently overlooked.

The information provided on each of the 27 models is intended to give readers a fairly in-depth view of what is required for a school to implement the model. Each model description was prepared by the model's developer through a format developed by the Institute and identifies contact persons and other sources that may be accessed for additional information. Before any serious consideration is given to the use of a model, we recommend that a more thorough investigation be undertaken.

It is our hope that this publication will contribute to the U.S. Department of Education's effort to carry out the White House directive to find strategies to turn around low-performing public schools.[1] The models can provide insight into transforming such schools with concrete and sustained results of student and school improvement without dramatically changing the nature of the student population.

---

[1]Clinton, William J., October 28, 1997, Memorandum for The Secretary of Education, *Turning Around Low-Performing Schools*.

Contents

Contents
(continued)

Introduction

The 27 research-based school reform models described in this publication either have been or are currently being supported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students, in the United States Department of Education. As part of its mission, the Institute supports the development of research-based knowledge and strategies promoting excellence and equity in the education of children and youth placed at risk of educational failure. Many of the research programs supported by the Institute have included the development, expansion, adaptation, evaluation, or analysis of components of school reform models. This publication is a compilation of information about those models. It is not the Institute's intent to endorse or promote any of these models, but merely to provide information about them. Further, we recommend that, before any serious consideration is given to the use of a model, a more in-depth review of the model be undertaken.

Background On School Reform Models

Thirty years of research and development on how to improve educational outcomes for schools serving significant numbers of students placed at risk of education failure have yet to result in any large scale improvement of educational outcomes and opportunities for these students and their schools. The Federal Government's Title I program in its successive iterations has become progressively more specific with regard to guidance offered to schools serving large numbers of educationally and economically disadvantaged children. To date, there is little evidence to suggest that the changes in educational practices resulting from the most recent Title I legislation directives, which include the elimination of pull-out programs, reduction of class size in the primary grades, high standards for all students, and greatly increased staff development activities, have been effective in raising student achievement.

There is emerging evidence that some research-based models of school reform, which provide clear guidance on specific changes schools and classrooms must make, can result in significant improvement in achievement outcomes for schools with large numbers of students placed at risk of educational failure. A recent study commissioned by the United States Department of Education to examine 10 promising strategies being used in Title I Schoolwide Project schools found that several of the programs, when well implemented, can make a difference in the academic achievement of students served by Title I.[2]

Perhaps one of the best known efforts to explore the use of school reform models to transform schools into places where all students can reach high standards of performance is the work of the

---

[2]Stringfield, S., Millsap, M.A., and Herman, R. April 1997. Urban and Suburban/Rural Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children. U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC.

New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC).[3] Following a nationwide competition, NASDC awarded grants in 1993 to 11 developers of comprehensive school reform models. The purpose of the grants was to enable the refinement of the models and to provide a vehicle for testing them in schools across the country. The NASDC experience and the on-going evaluation of this effort are providing growing evidence that comprehensive school reform models, when supported with a well thought through program of implementation, can help schools become high performance learning environments in which all students succeed. It should be noted, however, that the NASDC program does not specifically address itself to students placed at risk of education failure but articulates a focus on all students.

While comprehensive research-based school reform models vary widely in terms of their processes and content, there are several characteristics that successful models hold in common:[4]

- They provide a clear blueprint with specific instructions for the changes that are to be made by the school in order to improve its educational performance;

- They offer a system of guidance and technical assistance for schools, often by the developer, and, in order to have the widest application, offer instructions on how the model may be scaled up at a large number of sites;

- The changes that the models propose for implementation are comprehensive, involving school organization, social relations (parental involvement, relationships between school staff and student), curriculum and instruction, and educational standards and goals;

- The models are flexible, which allows them to be implemented on variable time scales and with adaptations to meet local circumstances; and

- The model designs are based on up-to-date research on curriculum and the learning environment.

Another characteristic of comprehensive research-based school reform models is that they provide educational policymakers with more accountability mechanisms. Thus, it is easier to determine whether or not schools are making the stipulated changes and to determine which changes are having an impact on student achievement outcomes.

---

[3]Stringfield, S., Ross, S., and Smith, L., Ed. 1996. Bold Plans for School Restructuring: The New American School Designs. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates: Mahwah, New Jersey.

[4]LaPoint, V.; Jordon, W.; McPartland, J.; and Towns, D. September 1996. *The Talent Development High School: Essential Components*. Report No. 1. Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk; Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland; and Howard University, Washington, DC.

Models Supported by the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students

The National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students defines a school reform model as a research-based comprehensive school reform, classroom or curriculum redesign, or professional development reform program that entails substantial changes in the ways schools function. The school reform models contained in this publication have been designed based on research conducted over the last three decades focusing on the changes that need to be made in order to improve the performance of schools serving significant numbers of children and youth placed at risk of educational failure.

It is important to keep in mind, however, that there are many other promising school reform models which are not covered in this publication, for the simple reason that they at no time received funding from this Institute. Additionally, there may be models that have received support from the Institute but were inadvertently overlooked. If so, we would encourage the developers to contact us at the address provided in appendix B, so that the model may be considered for inclusion in any future updates of this publication.

The reader is invited to consider three important factors when reviewing the model descriptions.

- The model designs span the spectrum from being highly prescriptive to providing only a set of guiding principles.

- Many of the models are still under development and design work is continuing as the models are implemented in various pilot test sites. Most of the models have two or more prototype sites where they are being implemented and tested.

- Each of the models is in an evolutionary state in which it is revised based on continuous evaluation and feedback from the teachers and others at the implementation sites. All of the models have some form of an evaluation design component associated with their development and implementation.

Based on the different foci of the 27 school-reform models, the publication is divided into three sections. The first section contains comprehensive school reform models which focus on changing the organizational climate of the school but also extend to influence changes in classroom instruction. The second section contains classroom or curriculum redesign models which are focused on changing classroom management, instruction or curriculum. The third section contains inservice professional development reform models whose primary focus is to strengthen the knowledge and skills of teachers and other staff working in schools serving large numbers of students at risk of educational failure. In cases where a model has multiple foci, an attempt has been made to include it in the section where there is the best fit.

Each model is outlined in a self-contained, easy-to-read four-page format. Each model description contains the following information sections:

- **What Is It?** — gives a brief descriptive overview of the model.
- **Why Did It Get Started?** — gives a short history of the model and what prompted its creation.
- **How Does It Work?** — provides a more detailed discussion of the various components of the model and how it works.
- **What Are The Costs?** — conveys some idea of the costs and also notes how implementing schools may be covering these costs.
- **How Is the Model Implemented In A School?** — discusses the steps and timelines necessary to implement the model and also the kind and level of technical assistance required.
- **What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?** — presents, in concise form, evaluation and research evidence to date demonstrating the model improves educational outcomes for students placed at risk.
- **Where Can I See It?** — identifies sites and sources that can be visited or contacted for more information about the model.
- **Whom Do I Contact?** — identifies a number of alternative routes for contacting the model developer for those desiring more information on the model. Through the developer, additional information, including research reports, videos, and other more in-depth information on the various models, can be requested.
- **The Research Base** — summarizes the bodies of research upon which the model is founded. References and more specific information can be requested from the developers.

The publication also contains two appendices. Appendix A groups the models according to three different subject categories. First, the models are grouped according to the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students research program or center with which they are affiliated. Second, the models are listed according to the grade levels upon which they focus. Lastly, a cross referencing system matches each model with specific educational priorities which research has shown are important in improving achievement for students placed at risk. A table depicting the cross referencing system also is included.

Information about the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students and its mission, programs, and staff is contained in appendix B.

Comprehensive School Reform Models

20/20 Analysis: A Tool for Instructional Planning

What Is It?

20/20 Analysis is a planning tool for developing an integrative service delivery plan that focuses on giving students who show the least and most progress on significant outcome variables intensive instruction and related service support. The goal of the program is to provide an analytic procedure for identifying students most in need of special help, based on student achievement and other outcome data routinely collected by schools and school districts. By identifying students in the lowest 20th and highest 20th percentiles, 20/20 Analysis pinpoints those students for whom the existing instructional and related service program delivery is least effective, so that it can be adapted to suit their individual needs.

Why Did It Get Started?

Current categorical programs designed to serve students with special needs are ineffective and cause a number of problems. In many schools, 50 percent or more of all students are placed in special categorical programs at some point between kindergarten and grade 12. The time and cost involved in such categorical evaluations and placements are staggering, and implementation of the categorical programs tends to be disjointed and ineffective in meeting students' needs.

How Does It Work?

20/20 Analysis consists of a two-phase process:

✎ *Needs Analysis*

Administrators and educators select an area of learning outcomes—such as reading, math, attendance, or disciplinary incidence—and assess students' performance within that area. For example, using existing data from standardized achievement tests, and/or curriculum-based assessment and teacher evaluations in reading achievement, the school staff then examine grade-wide or school-wide achievement levels to identify students who require "special" interventions. Achievement levels for students below the 20th percentile or above the 80th percentile are identified as "low 20" or "high 20" groups for whom curriculum adaptation and/or intensive instruction are needed.

By focusing on both the lowest and highest ends of the achievement continuum, findings from the 20/20 Analysis provide a broad, systematic, outcome-based approach to identifying students requiring special educational and related service support. 20/20 Analysis provides an alternative to the current practice of identifying or "certifying" students for the existing narrowly framed (and mostly disjointed) categorical programs, which tend to result in child labeling and program segregation.

✎ *Implementation Plan*

Phase two identifies and analyzes alternative ways to modify curriculum and instructional and related service delivery practices to the learning needs of individual students in the high- and low-20 groups. Emphasis at this phase of the analysis centers on programmatic implementation concerns that address the needs of the individual students and the development of individual program plans.

What Are The Costs?

The cost requirements vary, depending on the scope of analysis and need for follow-up activities (e.g., staff time to compile school district-collected data for analysis; staff time to develop an implementation plan for improving instructional and related service delivery; and staff time for implementation training). However, a central premise of the 20/20 approach is that the starting point for improvement is more efficient and effective use of current resources and finding creative ways to redeploy existing resources, including personnel to support implementation.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Implementation of Phase I, the Needs Analysis Phase, can be carried out by using school-collected data with very minimal staff time. This aspect of the analysis can be done by the district-level evaluators in the district's "accountability" or evaluation office.

Phase II involves the thorough examination of Phase I findings and active participation of teachers, parents, and related service providers to develop an implementation plan. This plan calls for a collaborative and coordinated appeal to service delivery to enhance learning opportunities for each student, focusing particularly on those in the bottom and top 20 percent group for whom adaptations of the curriculum and instructional and related services support are needed.

Specifically, 20/20 Analysis provides schools with the information necessary for developing service delivery plans that encompass a full range of coordinated approaches to meet the individual needs of all children, including and especially those at the margins of the achievement continuum. 20/20 Analysis is intended to facilitate program implementation efforts in integrated ways to reduce fragmentation and improve program effectiveness.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

20/20 Analysis has gained increasing support among schools interested in implementing comprehensive school reform, particularly in light of the Title I schoolwide program provisions of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA) and the 1997 reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, Part B). 20/20 Analysis directly addresses

many of the current problems in the delivery of special or categorical programs through a variety of vehicles, including those discussed below.

- Providing a reliable, accountable, and cost-effective process for identifying instructional and related service needs of the students in a given school or district. The current practice for identification and classification of students for special programs has become an increasingly costly venture. Program categories are ill defined, and classification is unreliable. The 20/20 procedure seeks to appropriately adapt school programs according to simple yet comprehensive and systematic procedures. This allows schools to quickly identify which students need extra support, without having to use costly and stigmatizing identification and classification methods in order to access services. Schools can then apply the money they would have spent on testing and categorization toward much needed services.

- Redesigning demeaning labels (e.g., learning disabled, attention deficient, or emotionally or educationally disturbed) that have no currency for instructional or learning improvement. The current classification and labeling system not only fails to provide any specific and practical interventions that can be used to meet the needs of the individual student but is likely to generate resistance from parents and have deeply stigmatic effects on children. With 20/20 Analysis procedures, the first step in diagnosis is not labeling but direct assessment of the learning needs and progress.

- Focusing on individual needs of students, especially those whose learning progress is marginal. This adds important dimensions of student achievement in ways that are instructionally relevant.

Implementation of the second phase of 20/20 Analysis has consistently brought about collaborative efforts among professionals with specialized expertise who sometimes operate in disjointed and competitive ways, and encouraging school- and district-wide coordination of programs.

By concentrating on the important outcomes or goals of education and the basic components of student learning, such as reading, quantitative thinking, and classroom behavior, implementation of 20/20 Analysis has resulted in significantly improved student outcomes for children at the margins and students in the middle of the achievement distribution. In 20/20 Analysis learning difficulties are indicators of intervention needs rather than student deficits. Greater efficiency and effectiveness in the delivery of special services can be accomplished through early detection, description of learning needs, and interventions.

Where Can I See It?

20/20 analyses are being carried out in selected schools in a variety of settings. Contact the Laboratory for Student Success for schools and school districts using 20/20 Analysis as a planning- and instructional-related service delivery tool.

Whom Do I Contact?

Dr. Margaret C. Wang, Professor and Director
Laboratory for Student Success at
Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education
1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122–6091
Telephone: 215–204–3000; Fax: 215–204–5130
Toll-free Telephone: 800–892–5550
E-mail: lss@vm.temple.edu; Website: http://www.temple.edu/LSS

The Research Base

Approximately 80 percent of the students now served in "special" categorical programs such as Special Education, Title I, as well as others who are in a variety of remedial and compensatory programs, show poor achievement in basic literacy skills. Findings from research demonstrate quite clearly that these students do not need different kinds of instruction, but more intensive quality instruction.

20/20 Analysis is a planning and program monitoring tool. It provides a systematic way of developing informed decisions utilizing existing school data. 20/20 analyses have been carried out in schools varying in geographic and socioeconomic characteristics. Feedback from these schools has indicated that the analysis is a feasible process and provides useful indicators for identifying students whose needs require greater-than-usual instruction and related services. Furthermore, the school staff sees 20/20 Analysis as a useful process for fostering a non-categorical approach to achieving targeted learning outcomes for individual students.

By assembling data over successive years, the 20/20 approach is useful in showing how successful individual schools are in improving the learning progress of low- and high-20 groups, as well as for average students. Longitudinal data show that some schools are consistently successful in increasing the progress of low-20 pupils (e.g., the data show low-20 pupils in first and second grades who rank significantly higher in terms of achievement by grades five and six). Data are also assembled to show characteristics of schools that are successful in increasing achievement at one or both margins (low-20, high-20, or both). Charting progress by various subgroups of students (e.g., African-Americans, Latinos, Native Americans) has been greatly facilitated—without the use of labeling or separations of students by category.

Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID)

What Is It?

AVID, an acronym for Advancement Via Individual Determination, is an "untracking" program designed to help underachieving students with high academic potential prepare for entrance to colleges and universities. The AVID approach to untracking places previously underachieving students (who are primarily from low income and ethnic or linguistic minority backgrounds) in the same college preparation academic program as high-achieving students (who are primarily from middle or upper-middle income and "majority" backgrounds). AVID features a rigorous academic elective course with a sequential curriculum for grades 7 through 12 that focuses on writing, inquiry, and collaboration as methodologies to accelerate student progress.

Why Did It Get Started?

The idea of untracking low-achieving students was introduced to San Diego in 1980 at Clairemont High. Under a court-ordered desegregation decree, minority students from predominantly ethnic minority schools in Southeast San Diego were bussed to the predominantly white school. Mary Catherine Swanson, chair of the English department, and the Clairemont faculty were unwilling to segregate African-American and Latino students into a separate, compensatory curriculum. Instead, they placed the bussed students in regular college prep classes and developed a support system that included tutors, note taking, writing as a tool of learning and, most importantly, open discussion between students and staff about how students learn best.

AVID soon spread beyond Clairemont High School. In 1984, one of Swanson's colleagues went to Madison High School, where she helped introduce AVID. Swanson was called to the San Diego County Office of Education in 1986 to implement the model county-wide and, in the spring semester of 1987, the San Diego City Schools School Board mandated the AVID's adoption in every high school. The program has since been adopted also by the Department of Defense Dependent Schools in Europe and Asia. By 1997, more than 500 high schools and middle schools in eight states and 13 foreign countries had introduced AVID programs.

How Does It Work?

AVID coordinators and site teams select students for the program. Low-income and linguistic minority students who have average- to high-achievement test scores and C-level grades, students who would be the first in their family to attend college, and students who have special circumstances that could impede their progress to college, are eligible for AVID.

The AVID curriculum at both the middle and high school level is composed of a series of libraries organized around writing as a tool of learning, inquiry, and collaboration. The curriculum is typically taught 2 or 3 days a week and AVID students complete formal writing domains based on anticipated college-level writing experiences. The previously underachieving students who are placed into college prep classes are not left to sink or swim, however. AVID has arranged a system of supports to assist students in making the transition from low-track to high-track high school classes.

- Among the most visible supports in the AVID program is a *special academic elective class* that meets for one academic period a day, 180 days a year, for the duration of the student's middle or high school experience. In addition to a classroom teacher, students are assisted by college tutors on a 7:1 tutor-student ratio.

- Two school days are designated *tutorial days*. On these days, students work in subject-specific groups, probing material deeply through a variety of inquiry methods, with the assistance of a specially trained tutor.

- One day a week, usually a Friday, is a "*motivational day*." It is devoted to guest speakers, field trips, or to goal setting or organizational activities.

- Those parents who agree to support their children's participation in the academic program sign *contracts* to have their children participate in AVID in high school.

What Are The Costs?

AVID is typically funded at the school-site level by school district, state, federal, or grant monies. The program coordinator required by AVID comes from the existing staff; tutors are recruited from local colleges and universities and paid for their services. Schools pay for staff development and curriculum materials. The cost for one classroom of 30 students is usually less than $10,000 per year.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Professional training and staff development are crucial ingredients in the AVID process. Staff development occurs in two stages. AVID Center conducts a summer institute in San Diego and other parts of the country each summer. AVID teachers are encouraged to attend and to bring other staff members to the institute. AVID Center provides follow-up staff development during the school year at school sites.

Each AVID Coordinator is encouraged to establish a "school site team" composed of teachers in academic departments, counselors, and administrators. This team provides advice and helps extend the model throughout the school. AVID Coordinators and school site team members are also encouraged to visit "demonstration schools" to see programs in operation.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Approximately 10,000 students have graduated from AVID programs and the program has been thoroughly researched by a variety of entities, including private foundations and federal and state agencies. Over 90 percent of AVID's graduates attend college and 89 percent of those students are still in college after 2 years.

A study of the AVID program in 14 high schools in the San Diego City Schools system from 1990 to 1992 found that, during that period, 1,053 students who had participated in the program for 3 years graduated, while only 288 students started the program but left after completing 1 year or less. Of the 248 students selected randomly for follow-up, 48 percent reported attending 4-year colleges and 40 percent reported attending 2-year colleges. The 48 percent rate of enrollment in 4-year colleges for students who have been "untracked" compares favorably with the San Diego City Schools' average of 37 percent and the national average of 39 percent.

The AVID untracking program assists the academic achievement of low-income African-American and Latino students. Of the Latino students who have participated in AVID for 3 years, 43 percent enroll in 4-year colleges. This rate compares favorably to the San Diego City Schools average of 25 percent and the national average of 29 percent. Of the African-American students who have participated in AVID for 3 years, 55 percent enroll in 4-year colleges, compared to 35 percent from the San Diego City Schools and a national average of 33 percent.

AVID students who come from the lowest income strata (i.e., their parents' median income is below $19,999) enroll in 4-year colleges in equal or higher proportions to students who come from higher income strata (parents' median income between $20,000 and $65,000).

Where Can I See It?

Demonstration sites are available in many parts of the United States. Contact one of the AVID Centers for the nearest sites.

Whom Do I Contact?

The AVID National Center
McConaughy House
2490 Heritage Park Row
San Diego, California 92110
Telephone: 619–682–5050
Fax: 619–682–5060

AVID Eastern Division
Christopher Newport University
Smith Annex
Newport News, Virginia 23607
Telephone: 757–594–8711
Fax: 757–594–8817

E-mail: robgira@aol.com; Website: http://www.sdcoe.k12.ca.us/iss/AVID

The Research Base

The AVID model is based on research suggesting that all students can learn challenging material if the right types of support are provided; and, more specifically, that low-performing students do better when they are given accelerated learning opportunities rather than remedial material. The model also derives from research on alternatives to tracking, and theories and research pertaining to how to foster the positive relationships and supportive conditions that are so important during students' secondary school years.

Community for Learning Program

What Is It?

The Community for Learning Program (CFL) is a broad-based, school-family-community, coordinated approach to improving student learning. The major premise of this school-based intervention program is that the national standards of educational outcomes can and must be upheld for all students, including those who are "at the margins." A centerpiece of the Community for Learning Program is an integrated design framework for a collaborative process of finding ways to harness all of the resources, expertise, and energies in linking schools with other learning environments, including homes, churches, libraries, public- and private-sector workplaces, and postsecondary institutions to support the learning of each student.

Why Did It Get Started?

There is a growing demand for educational reforms to improve schools' capacity to more effectively and efficiently serve all students, including those from educationally and economically disadvantaged backgrounds, by providing inclusive and coordinated educational and related services. The quality of life available to these children and families is threatened by a perilous set of modern morbidities that often involve poverty, lack of employment opportunities, disorderly and stressful environments, poor health care, children born to children, and highly fragmented patterns of service. The Community for Learning Program seeks to unite the resources and expertise of the school, the family, and the community in fostering educational resilience and learning success of inner-city children and youth.

How Does It Work?

Implementation of the Community for Learning components is supported by a delivery system that provides organizational and professional development support at the school and classroom levels. The Community for Learning Program includes three major components:

- The *Schoolwide Reform Development Component* assists schools in making site-based management and decision-making to ensure effective implementation of a coordinated team approach to service delivery;

- The *Family-Community Support Component* provides a formal mechanism for linking the resources and energies of families and the community to support student learning; and

- The *Adaptive Learning Environments Model*, an instructional delivery system designed with an inclusive approach for meeting the diverse needs of individual

students in regular classroom settings, including special education, Title I, and bilingual students.

Specifically, the Community for Learning Program design consists of the following key program components that address the learning needs of the students, the organizational and administrative support requirements for achieving a high degree of program implementation, and the staff development needs of the school staff and related service providers.

- A *site-specific implementation plan* that takes into account the school's program improvement needs; the learning characteristics and needs of the students; staff expertise and staffing patterns; curricular standards and assessment; and other implementation-related concerns.

- A *schoolwide organizational structure that supports a teaming process* by involving regular and specialist teachers in the planning and delivery of instruction in regular classroom settings.

- A data-based *staff development program* that provides ongoing training and technical assistance tailored to meet the needs of the individual staff and program implementation requirements.

- An *instructional-learning management system* that focuses on developing student self-responsibility for behavior and learning.

- An *integrated assessment-instruction process* that provides an individualized learning plan for each student, utilizing multiple approaches like whole-class and small-group instruction, as well as one-on-one tutoring, based on an ongoing analysis of student needs, resources, and expediency.

- A *family and community involvement plan* that aims to enhance communication between the school and families and to forge a shared responsibility partnership and community connections to achieve the schooling success of every student.

- A *school-linked comprehensive, coordinated health and human services delivery program* that focuses on the wellness and learning success of each student.

What Are The Costs?

The costs for implementing the program vary from site to site, depending on needs and available resources. However, in most schools the only added cost required is pre-implementation training of school staff. The program delivery system is built on existing resources with redeployment rather than requiring additional funds. The ongoing professional development of the school staff

builds on and redeploys existing resources. No purchase of specially designed curriculum is required.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Implementation of the Community for Learning Program focuses on site-specific planning to effectively integrate what is known to work in developing a site-specific plan to support the implementation of the program. A two-step process is involved:

- The first is a comprehensive needs assessment involving all stakeholder groups, including the school staff (e.g., regular and special education teachers and other "specialist" professionals such as school psychologists, speech pathologists, and others), the building and district leadership team, the parents, and the community.

- The second step consists of planning and the actual process of implementation, which typically involves the school-based personnel who are responsible for program implementation at the school level, as well as involvement of families and community agencies whose resources and expertise are mobilized to support student learning.

The specific design of the program to be implemented at each Community for Learning school site is based on the information obtained from the comprehensive needs assessment. Design decisions to be made at the building level include how the resources identified during the needs assessment will be used, modified, and reallocated for effective implementation.

A school-specific delivery system for implementing the Community for Learning Program involves identifying targeted program participants (students and staff); deploying or redeploying school staff; student placement and scheduling; space, facilities, and materials utilization; program monitoring and evaluation; communicating and disseminating program implementation and monitoring; and specific documentation of program implementation and program outcomes.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

The Community for Learning Program implementation seeks to impact three major areas of student outcomes: (1) improved student achievement, particularly for those at the margins of achievement distribution; (2) patterns of active learning and teaching processes consistent with the research based on effective classroom practices; and (3) positive attitudes by students and school staff toward their school learning environment.

Findings to date show a general pattern of more positive perceptions about classrooms and schools in Community for Learning schools, as compared to students in comparison schools. Students in Community for Learning schools tend to perceive better and more constructive feedback from teachers about their work and behaviors, a higher level of aspiration for academic

learning, better academic self-concept, and clearer rules for behaviors and class and school operations. The data also show a positive pattern of changes in math and reading scores, and that Community for Learning students outperformed comparison school students on both subjects. Other noteworthy findings include the observation that families and the community became increasingly active in a wide range of school activities and in the decision-making process.

Where Can I See It?

Contact the Laboratory for Student Success at Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education for a list of demonstration sites available for visitation.

Whom Do I Contact?

Dr. Margaret C. Wang, Professor and Director
Laboratory for Student Success at
Temple University Center for Research in
Human Development and Education
1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122–6091
Telephone: 215–204–3000 or 800–892–5550; Fax: 215–204–5130
E-mail: lss@vm.temple.edu; Website: http://www.temple.edu/LSS

The Research Base

The development of the Community for Learning Program was influenced by over 2 decades of research and field-based implementation of innovative school programs. In particular, it draws from the research base on fostering educational resilience of children and youth beset by multiple, co-occurring risks; and from the field-based implementation of two widely implemented school restructuring programs that focus on school organization and instructional delivery in ways that are responsive to the development and learning needs of the individual child. In addition, the model draws upon research on and field-based experiences of the forging of functional connections among school, family, and community resources in coordinated ways to significantly improve the capacity for development and education of children and youth. At the core of the Community for Learning design is a coordinated approach to service delivery that calls for shared responsibility among collaborative teams of school-based professionals and related services and community agencies, and the forging of close connections with the family and the community.

Consensus Standards Model

What Is It?

The Consensus Standards Model is a school reform project of the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence, University of California, Santa Cruz. The model is based on five standards of effective pedagogy for at-risk students. The standards reflect the intentions of the standards-based reform movement to ensure high expectations for all students and those principles of teaching and learning on which educators, researchers, and program developers across theoretical domains agree. They represent consensus in educational research and theory about maximizing teaching and learning for all students, but especially those at risk due to limited-English proficiency, cultural diversity, poverty, race, or geography.

The Center's research continues to refine and extend these standards, but current practice can benefit by regular enactment of the following standards of effective pedagogy: *joint productive activity, language development, contextualization, cognitive complexity, and instructional conversation.* These consensus standards are entirely consistent with natural teaching and learning in all informal community, cultural, productive, and familial settings. However, schools traditionally have not put these standards into practice. Because of the broad similarity between school, family, and community practices of majority-culture students, schools could rely on family and community members to provide the activity, the conversation, the language development, and the shared context necessary for learning. This is no longer true in our culturally and linguistically diverse nation. Schools must now provide the common experience, activity, language, and conversation that learners require, both for individual development and the development of a common, shared, and mutually endorsed community.

Why Did It Get Started?

This model began as an effort to improve instruction and achievement in schools serving cultural- and linguistic-minority students. Although innovative school reform programs typically concentrate on specific cultural, linguistic, or ethnic populations and on specific communities, general recommendations for improvement can be made for which there exists a great deal of consensus among educators. Nonetheless, these general recommendations for practice must be enacted in specific local contexts and, therefore, adapted to local conditions.

How Does It Work?

The model is based upon five standards of effective pedagogy:

- *Joint Productive Activity* — facilitate learning through joint productive activity among teachers and students;

- *Language Development* — develop competence in the language and literacy of instruction;

- *Contextualization* — contextualize teaching and curriculum in the experiences and skills of home and community;

- *Cognitive Complexity* — challenge students toward cognitive complexity; and

- *Instructional Conversation* — engage students through dialogue, especially the instructional conversation.

We have developed a reliable process for transforming any classroom from a unitary organization characterized by teaching through a recitation script, into a more differentiated social organization containing varied, simultaneous, related, and appropriate activity settings. Effective teaching can only occur in sound social organization. Knowledge is constructed through activity and socially constructed through conversation, and therefore is determined by the social organization of teaching and learning. It is crucial that schools design and implement activity settings that are varied, appropriate to the given task and students, and meaningfully interrelated.

Classrooms must be reconceptualized into a vision that includes many activities, all productive and simultaneous. To enable enactment of the five generic standards, in particular joint productive activity with teacher and peers and opportunities for the instructional conversation, it follows that classrooms must employ *multiple, simultaneous, and diversified activity settings*. The instructional conversation cannot take place in whole-class settings of 30 students, or even of 15. If there are small groups of four to seven students engaged in conversation with the teacher, the balance of the students must be engaged productively in independent group settings. If there is to be genuine joint activity, it cannot involve 30 students doing the same thing; rather, even when there is a joint class-wide project (for example, a school newspaper to be written), there must be smaller activity settings, differentiated and simultaneous to allow true joint participation with others. Through instructional conversation and working on a joint product with four to seven students, the teacher is effectively able to maintain accurate assessments and provide assistance responsively.

What Are The Costs?

Operating schools and classrooms according to this model entails no extra cost. The costs of training and staff development vary with the methods and intensity of the model.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

The primary means for reform is through teacher professional development and a professional development portfolio and evaluation process. Various activities for professional development, described below, have been employed and are available from the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence.

- *Professional Development Training and Support* is designed to develop professional competence in the Standards for Effective Pedagogy. While teachers and supervisors may aim toward mastery, others may need training at a level to discriminate, evaluate, or support the performance of others. Training and support are available for a variety of professionals: teachers, leaders, specialists, and policy makers. Training formats range from half-day sessions to year-long development packages, and are available for trainers or teachers.

- *Teaching Alive!* is a *CD-ROM* that has been created for use by teachers, teacher educators, school administrators, and researchers. It explains each of the standards and allows the user to view video clips of enactments of each.

- A *Professional Development Portfolio and Evaluation* Process includes a portfolio evaluation process and manual for teachers, intended to facilitate professional growth and authentic assessment of essential teaching competencies.

- *Research Methods, Training and Materials* for a classroom observation system based in activity setting theory also are available. The Activity Setting Observation System (ASOS), instrumental in research or teacher professional development, determines the presence of classroom features aligned with the Standards for Effective Pedagogy.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

There are a wide variety of evaluation studies that have examined the effects on student performance when teachers use each of the standards separately. Evaluation of the fully organized five-standards enacted version is currently under way at the Zuni Middle School, Zuni, New Mexico.

Where Can I See It?

The CD-ROM *Teaching Alive!* is available through the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence for use by teachers, teacher educators, school administrators, and researchers. A schoolwide application can be seen in a school reform program at Zuni Middle School, Zuni, New Mexico. Visits are available only by advance arrangement.

Whom Do I Contact?

Roland Tharp, Director
Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, California 95064
Telephone: 408–459–3500; Fax: 408–459–3502
E-mail: crede@cats.ucsc.edu; Web site: http://www.crede.ucsc.edu

The Research Base

Thorough reading of the literature in research, development, and evaluation of educational programs for all cultural and social groups over a long period of time and across a wide range of settings has resulted in the extraction of five standards of effective pedagogy. Remarkable similarities are present in the research-based recommendations, which suggests that effective instruction for all groups includes these same "generic" elements because they make school success possible for all groups.

The Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy were evaluated, enacted, and tested by university researchers and 15 volunteer teachers in Zuni, New Mexico, middle and high school classrooms. Teachers and researchers co-constructed means for enacting the standards. From videotapes of these classrooms, a library was created that includes excellent and varied enactments of the standards.

Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline

What Is It?

Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline (CMCD) is a research-based, classroom and school reform model that builds on shared responsibility for learning and classroom organization between teachers and students. The program works with geographic feeder systems of schools from pre-kindergarten through twelfth grade that includes all students, teachers and administrators in one geographic area of the city. The program provides sustained messages to children about what it means to be self-disciplined. Messages that are changed every year or are inconsistent for every classroom diminish discipline and achievement.

Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline also provides a sustainable message for all who work with children: administrators, teachers, specialists, aides, cafeteria workers, and bus drivers. The project provides support to educational professionals and staff over a 3-year period through staff development, school-based facilitators, and ongoing research data on student and teacher perspectives of school climate and discipline referrals to the office (which is provided to the schools throughout the year). The teacher is able to create a consistent but flexible learning environment and joins with the students in establishing a cooperative plan for classroom rules, procedures, use of time, and academic learning that governs the classroom, all within a developing democratic structure. Classrooms and schools are usually the last place one finds democratic principles, but they should be the first.

The Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline philosophy incorporates five themes in order to build resilience with inner-city youth:

- *Prevention* — classroom management is problem prevention rather than problem solving, thus reducing the need for intervention;
- *Caring* — a caring environment is the foundation for school reform (students want to know how much you care, not how much you know);
- *Cooperation* — moving from tourists to citizens leads to ownership, involvement and greater opportunities for student self-discipline;
- *Organization* — classroom organization is a mutual responsibility that adds valuable teaching and learning time and builds student ownership and self-discipline; and
- *Community* — a tapestry of parental and community involvement activities and events are necessary to link school with home and meet the needs of the changing American family.

Each theme includes strategies and activities that allow students to become real partners in the classroom.

The definition for the Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline program is evolving. It is being expanded by those most closely influenced by the program— teachers, students, administrators and parents. This evolution is also being shaped by longitudinal research studies of classroom environments, discipline and learning.

Why Did It Get Started?

The program was first implemented in 1986–1987 at the invitation of the Houston Independent School District and the faculty and administration of five elementary schools identified as the lowest academic performing schools in Texas. The faculty and administration identified classroom management as the greatest barrier to school improvement and the academic success of their children. Research that began during this time period was extended when the Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline program was asked to participate in the National Center on Education In The Inner Cities. During the last 4 years, the program has expanded to middle and high school levels, providing support for entire geographic feeder patterns of schools in the inner cities. Currently, the Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline program is in feeder patterns of schools in Houston, Chicago, Norfolk and Amsterdam, Netherlands.

How Does It Work?

The Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline Project seeks to turn student "tourists" into student "citizens' by helping educators create active classrooms where cooperation, participation, and support are the cornerstones. As students move from one grade level to the next and from one school to the next (elementary, middle and high school), they continue to experience expanding opportunities for active participation in the management of their classrooms and schools.

As the name suggests, Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline has two distinct components.

- *Consistency Management* focuses on classroom and instructional organization and planning by the teacher. From seating arrangements to passing out papers, sharpening pencils, attendance taking, using time, and providing equal opportunity to participate in class, the teacher, as the instructional leader, creates a supportive and caring environment in which all members can participate and learn.

- *Cooperative Discipline* expands the leadership roles in the classroom from the teacher to the students. It gives *all* students the opportunity to become leaders. Given multiple chances for leadership in small and large ways, students gain the experiences necessary to become self-disciplined. Students are partners and stakeholders in the classroom, from creating a classroom constitution to establishing new job responsibilities for some fifty tasks that teachers usually take upon themselves.

The staff development program is timed to match the needs of teachers and students. The first Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline session is held in the Spring, with an all-day workshop and a follow-up in May. This is timed when the need for caring and peaceful learning environments are at a premium. A second 2-day workshop is provided before school begins in August; four 3-hour workshops are held approximately once every 2 months after school from September until March. Thirty-six contact hours of faculty and principal development are provided to each Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline program school.

During the second year, an all-day before-school workshop is provided to the original cohort of teachers, and a second set of four staff development sessions are presented in year 2 for teachers new to the schools. High-implementing teachers also become Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline facilitators for the school and are responsible for keeping the knowledge base of the program at the classroom and school level. Sessions for the new teachers include training on the development of classroom rules and procedures, effective use of instructional time, student motivation, teacher self-assessments and peer observations, school management, community and parental involvement, and faculty-administrator team building.

What Are The Costs?

Costs vary based on the size of the school and the number of students. The planning year is a 6-month period that begins in January and ends in July. The cost for planning the initial implementation period is about 1 to 2 percent of the school budget. The planning year also includes two implementation workshops. The second and third years reflect full implementation and require a full-time Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline facilitator for every three elementary schools and one facilitator for each secondary school. The costs for the second and third years are 3 to 5 percent of the total school budget.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

The school district and feeder schools are provided an overview of the program. The first year the program is implemented at the elementary school level, with years 2 and 3 beginning with the middle and high schools, respectively. Each level has 3 years of support from the program. At least 70 percent affirmative vote of the professional staff is needed before the program may begin in a school.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

The Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline program has been replicated in controlled studies over time. The findings from both qualitative and quantitative studies show a strong positive change in many of the outcomes viewed as desirable for reforming schools and transforming classrooms including: sustained gains in student achievement over 3 years (three-fourths year to one full year greater achievement gain over a group of comparison schools); significant reductions in student discipline referrals to the office (48 percent to 80 percent fewer than in previous years); more teaching time, with an evaluator reporting teachers are gaining 36 more minutes of teaching time each day due to fewer discipline problems and greater student cooperation. This is the equivalent of 3½ additional weeks of instruction. Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline has undergone extensive research on its initial and long-term effectiveness. When students and teachers see each other as partners, the instructional climate (teaching and learning) improves for both teachers and students.

Where Can I See It?

The Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline program can be seen in 20 schools in Houston, Texas. Several of the schools have a 4- to 6-year record of implementation. Other schools in Chicago, Norfolk, and Amsterdam may also be viewed but are earlier in the implementation cycle.

Whom Do I Contact?

H. Jerome Freiberg, Project Director
Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline
College of Education, University of Houston
Houston, Texas 77204–5874
Telephone: 713–743–8663; Fax: 713–743–8664
E-mail: CMCD@uh.edu; Web page: http://www.coe.uh.edu./~freiberg/cm/

The Research Base

The Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline program integrated the research from several educational and organization perspectives including school effectiveness, classroom management, school climate and mission, teaching effectiveness and learner gains, and staff development.

Éxito Para Todos
(Spanish Bilingual Adaptation of Success for All)

What Is It?

Éxito Para Todos is an adaptation of Success for All used in schools with Spanish bilingual classes. Reading curricula in Spanish includes Lee Conmigo (Read with Me), which is used for beginning readers and is begun at the end of kindergarten or in first grade, and Alas Para Leer, which is used at the second grade reading level and above. They are designed to ensure that children are successful in learning to read and write in Spanish in the early grades, and then make a successful transition to English reading in the upper elementary grades. Éxito Para Todos can be used in bilingual programs (including two-way bilingual programs) with transition at any age; it has Spanish reading materials available from kindergarten through grade six. In addition to Spanish and transitional reading programs, Éxito Para Todos provides one-to-one Spanish tutoring to primary-aged children having difficulties in reading, family support services, and other elements common to Success for All schools.

Why Did It Get Started?

Éxito Para Todos was first developed in 1990 by researchers at what is now the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk at Johns Hopkins University. It was created to adapt the Success for All reform model to schools serving many Spanish-dominant students in bilingual programs. By 1990, evidence from the original English version of Success for All was showing strong positive effects on the reading performance of students in high-poverty schools. Éxito Para Todos came into being as a means of extending this model into bilingual schools.

How Does It Work?

Specific elements of the program are described below.

✎ *Reading, Writing, and Language Arts*

Lee Conmigo provides a balanced approach to the teaching of Spanish reading in kindergarten and first grade. At this level, it uses a series of mini-books, specially written for the program, which introduce letters, syllables, and sound-blending strategies in a meaningful and enjoyable context. While the books are written in Spanish (not translated) and are appropriate to Latino language and culture, the instructional strategies are identical to those used in the English program and, in fact, bilingual and English-only teachers can be trained together.

At the second through fifth grade levels, students use Alas Para Leer with school—or district—selected Spanish reading materials in a carefully structured set of interactive

opportunities to read, discuss, and write. This program emphasizes cooperative learning activities built around partner reading, story summarization, writing, and direct instruction in reading comprehension skills.

Materials and instructional procedures designed to facilitate transition from Spanish to English reading are available regardless of the age of transition, from second to sixth grade. A writing and language arts approach based on writing process methods engages students in planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing compositions in a variety of genres. Language mechanics skills are taught in close connection with composition.

✎ *Cooperative Learning*

This is the vehicle that drives the Éxito Para Todos curriculum. Students work together in partnerships and teams, helping one another to become strategic readers and writers. Emphasis is placed on individual accountability, common goals, and recognition of team success.

✎ *Tutors*

Specially trained certified teachers or paraprofessionals work one-on-one in Spanish with any students who are failing to keep up with their classmates in reading. Priority is given to first grade students.

✎ *English as a Second Language*

English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction is closely coordinated with reading instruction in Éxito Para Todos. ESL teachers help children develop general English language skills, but also to develop proficiency in the vocabulary of the school subjects they are learning in English. A separate English adaptation of Success for All for the needs of students who are speakers of languages other than English has also been developed. In this model, ESL teachers are fully integrated in the school's instructional program, serving as reading teachers and tutors for at-risk limited English proficient (LEP) students.

✎ *Facilitators*

A full-time facilitator works with teachers in each Éxito Para Todos school to help them implement the reading program. The facilitator also helps implement the 8-week assessments, assists the Family Support Team, plans and implements staff development, and works with teachers to ensure that every child is making adequate progress.

✎ *Eight-Week Assessments*

Students in grades one through six are assessed every 8 weeks to determine whether they are making adequate progress in reading. This information is used to assign students to tutoring, to

suggest alternative teaching strategies in the regular reading classroom, and to make changes in reading group placement, family support interventions, or other means to meet student needs.

✎ *Family Support Team*

The Family Support Team, composed of the principal or assistant principal, facilitator, social worker, and other building personnel, works with parents to help ensure the success of their children. The team focuses on promoting parent involvement, developing plans to meet the needs of students having difficulty with tardiness and attendance, and integrating community and school resources to benefit students.

What Are The Costs?

Éxito Para Todos is typically funded by reallocations of existing Title I, state compensatory, and special education funds in high poverty schools. The program facilitator and tutors required by the program generally come from existing school personnel, such as Title I-funded teachers. Costs for materials and training vary according to school size and other factors, but average $60,000 to $70,000 during the first year for a school of 500 students. This figure drops to approximately $25,000 in the second year.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

All teachers receive a detailed teacher's manual supplemented by 3 days of inservice at the beginning of the school year provided by Éxito Para Todos trainers. Throughout the year, follow-up visits are made to the school by project trainers who visit classrooms, meet with school staff, and conduct in service presentations on such topics as classroom management, instructional pace, and cooperative learning. The staff development model used in Éxito Para Todos emphasizes relatively brief initial training with extensive classroom follow-up, coaching, and group discussion. The building facilitator also organizes informal sessions to allow teachers to share problems, suggest changes, and discuss individual children.

Prior to adopting Éxito Para Todos, district and building administrators, teachers, and parents are encouraged to review program materials, view videotapes, and visit nearby Éxito Para Todos school sites. A school entering the program must have the vote of 80 percent or more of its staff in support of its adoption.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Éxito Para Todos has been extensively evaluated in comparison to matched control schools. Studies in Modesto and Riverside, California, in Philadelphia, and in Houston have found that students in Éxito Para Todos schools perform substantially better than control students on scales from the Spanish Woodcock. The California studies also showed a significantly higher rate of

transition from Spanish to English for Éxito Para Todos students, by the third grade. The Philadelphia study found higher English reading performance for students from Puerto Rico initially taught in Éxito Para Todos. A study involving 35 schools in Houston found significantly higher achievement for Éxito Para Todos than control students on Spanish measures.

Éxito Para Todos is currently in use in bilingual programs in many parts of the United States, especially Texas, California, Chicago, and New York City. The ESL adaptation is being widely used with speakers of Spanish, Haitian Creole, Cambodian, and many other languages.

Where Can I See It?

Demonstration sites are available in many parts of the United States. Contact the Success for All program for the nearest sites.

Whom Do I Contact?

Success for All Program
Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Telephone: 800–548–4998; Fax: 410–516–0543
E-mail: bcoppersm@csos.jhu.edu; Website: http://www.csos.jhu.edu/sfa/sfa.html

The Research Base

Éxito Para Todos, a program designed to be used with classes of Spanish-speaking children in the elementary grades, uses the same research-based instructional strategies used in the Success for All program. The materials used in Éxito Para Todos are in Spanish. The curricula are not translations from English, but consist of books and materials appropriate to the children's culture and language. Éxito has reading materials appropriate for kindergarten through grade six students.

Like the Success for All model, Éxito Para Todos is predicated on research stressing the importance of early academic success. Éxito incorporates a number of prevention and intervention strategies designed to insure that the Spanish-speaking children in a school develop strong foundations in reading in Spanish in the early grades. English as a Second Language instruction is closely coordinated with reading instruction in Éxito Para Todos. The Éxito program is designed around research findings suggesting that Spanish-dominant students perform better when they are successful in learning to read and write in Spanish in the early grades, and then supported in making a transition to English reading in the upper elementary grades.

National Network of Partnership Schools

What Is It?

The National Network of Partnership Schools includes school, district, and state members and provides each with research-based guidance, support, materials, and networking opportunities to assist them in building strong school-family-community partnerships. Partnership programs are based on school improvement goals and the needs and interests of students, parents, and teachers. The main structures—an Action Team for School, Family, and Community Partnerships and research-based framework of six types of involvement—strengthen family and community connections within any school improvement model. The approach also may be used to organize comprehensive whole-school reform using Action Teams and connections with families and communities to guide plans and activities for all school goals and objectives.

Why Did It Get Started?

During the past decade, the development of school, family, and community partnerships has been recognized as an important part of improving the education of all students, including students placed at risk. Most educators want to build strong partnerships, and most schools engage in various forms of promoting family and community involvement. But developing good home, school, and community connections needs to be an organized, ongoing process that is connected to all aspects of school improvement and that includes all types of involvement. The National Network of Partnership Schools was developed in response to this need. The components of the program have been developed and tested for over a decade in collaboration with many educators, parents, students, and community groups.

How Does It Work?

States, districts, and schools carry out the following commitments as members of the National Network of Partnership Schools.

- Each *state* identifies and provides for an office, department, or center for school, family, and community partnerships in the State Department of Education. This office must include at least one full-time-equivalent professional and adequate staff to coordinate and conduct activities to promote and support school-family-community partnerships across districts and schools.

- Each *district* identifies staff to support district level and school level programs of partnerships. A full-time equivalent facilitator is required to work with from 15–30 schools, with part-time equivalents in smaller districts. District facilitators may provide training, recognition, small grants, and other guidance.

- ✎ Each *school* creates an Action Team for School, Family, and Community Partnerships, and uses a framework of six types of involvement to plan and implement a comprehensive program of partnerships linked to school goals.

All school, district, and state members must communicate with Network staff annually to share their progress and plans to continue as members. Support provided by the Network includes: the manual *School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action*; certificates of membership; training workshops to help Key Contacts develop skills and strategies; a semi-annual newsletter; on-call, e-mail, and website assistance for on-going staff development; and annual research and evaluation projects to increase knowledge about the processes and results of partnerships.

What Are The Costs?

There are no membership fees to join this Network and manuals, newsletters, training, and other materials and services are offered at no cost to members. However, states, districts, and schools must provide funding for their own programs as described below.

At the state level, an annual budget must be established to cover the costs of staff and programs. Staff may be drawn from existing personnel with some revision of current duties. State costs may also include funding to support district and school initiatives. Ohio, for example, has awarded planning grants of $500 each to over 200 schools to develop and improve their partnership programs, and will provide larger implementation grants to a number of schools under a competitive grants program. Wisconsin uses Goals 2000 funds for conferences, training, and grants to schools and districts. Other states and districts have other ways of providing incentives and support for the development and maintenance of programs of partnership.

At the district level, costs include the salary of a full-time-equivalent facilitator who works with from 15–30 schools, or a part-time equivalent in smaller districts. Funding also is needed for training, end-of-year conferences, small grants, and other activities to assist all schools, and for district-level programs and activities for families and communities.

At the school level, each school must establish at least a nominal annual budget for developing and conducting practices of partnership. Action Team members are drawn from existing school, family, and community personnel.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Schools that join the National Network of Partnership Schools begin implementation by creating an *Action Team for School, Family, and Community Partnerships*. The Action Team uses its school improvement plan or school goals as the basis for a "One-Year Action Plan," including activities for the six major types of involvement: parenting, communicating, volunteering,

learning at home, decision making, and collaborating with the community. The Action Teams are guided in this process by descriptions and tools provided in the Network's *Handbook for Action.*

Each Action Team consists of at least six members, including teachers, parents, administrators, counselors, students in the upper grades, and others. The Team first inventories the school's present practices of partnerships using surveys, checklists, or discussion groups. Most schools find that they already carry out many practices that link the school, home, and community, but which vary in quality. Based on the inventory, the Action Team develops a "Three-Year Outline" of goals for partnerships. The Team writes a One-Year Action Plan that details all activities for the school year, and how the activities will be implemented and evaluated.

To organize their work, each Action Team member serves as chair or co-chair of one of six subcommittees, each taking responsibility for working with others in the school to address and improve actions for the six types of involvement. For example, the chair of the Action Team's *Type 2—Communication Committee* might work with other teachers, parents, students, and community members to plan, monitor and improve the school newsletter, conference schedules and content, or how report card information is understood by students and families. The chair of the *Type 4—Learning Activities at Home Committee* might work with other teachers and parents to improve students' completion of homework, and create better home-school links in homework for reading, math, writing, and science in order to increase students' skills. Each committee works to make progress every year on all six types of involvement to reach all families and meet major goals.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

In Fall 1997, the National Network of Partnership Schools had a membership of 8 states, over 60 districts, and over 750 schools, with the numbers continuing to grow. Studies of the processes and results of this approach are accumulating. A case study analysis of six urban schools using the Action Team approach documents significant increases in parent and community involvement, improved interpersonal relations, and more positive perceptions of the schools. Analyses of data on the partnership program of 39 schools in Baltimore City suggest that schools that strengthen their school, family, and community partnerships boost student attendance, and reading and writing achievement significantly beyond predictions based on the prior year's data. Data from members of the National Network of Partnership Schools indicate that schools have stronger partnership programs in districts that not only have written policies about involvement but also provide help to schools' Action Teams.

Where Can I See It?

There are schools and districts in the Network located in over 30 states. School, district, and state contacts can be arranged and information provided.

Whom Do I Contact?

Dr. Joyce L. Epstein, Director, or Dr. Mavis G. Sanders, Assistant Director
National Network of Partnership Schools
Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships
Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3003 North Charles Street, Suite 200
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Telephone: 410–516–8800; Fax: 410–516–8890
E-mail: p2000@csos.jhu.edu; Website: http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000

The Research Base

A multitude of research studies in the United States and other nations have examined how family environments influence parental involvement, how school environments influence family involvement, and the effects of school-family-community partnerships on parents, students, and teachers. The studies deliver a clear message: families are important for children's learning, development, and school success from preschool through high school.

Recent studies have better identified the specific effects of different types of involvement. For example, several studies show that parental assistance and interaction at home have important consequences for children's achievement, attendance, school adaptability, and classroom behavior through high school. Other studies report that students in grades three and five improve their reading achievement when teachers frequently involve parents in reading activities at home, and that students in the middle grades improve their writing skills with interactive writing homework. Still other studies show that the number of parent volunteers increases when schools organize programs that welcome, prepare, and recognize volunteers.

Research indicates that school-family-community partnerships can effectively reach and influence most families, including low-income, minority, and single-parent families. For example, inner-city parents whose children are in classrooms in which teachers involve families report that they receive many ideas about how to help at home and understand more than in previous years about what their child is being taught.

The National Network of Partnership Schools guides state, district, and school personnel to build their capacities to improve school, family, and community partnership programs. Such programs enable all families to remain informed and involved in their children's education at all grade levels. With direct links to educational goals for student performance, connections of home-school-community are central to the success of whole-school change and school improvement.

Native American Instructional Programs: Standards for Effective Pedagogy

What Is It?

The primary aim of this model is to develop and evaluate a major model for school reform consistent with the intentions of the standards-based reform movement to ensure high expectations for all students. This model combines research knowledge about effective Native American education with research knowledge about institutional reform standards, and focuses on culturally compatible pedagogy. The projects are guided by seven standards of effective instruction. These include five generally accepted standards for effective pedagogy for all students:

- *Joint Productive Activity* — facilitate learning through joint productive activity among teachers and students;
- *Language Development* — develop competence in the language and literacy of instruction;
- *Contextualization* — contextualize teaching and curriculum in the experiences and skills of home and community;
- *Cognitive Complexity* — challenge students toward cognitive complexity; and
- *Instructional Conversation* — engage students through dialogue, especially the instructional conversation.

In addition, there are two Native American-specific standards:

- *Modeling and Demonstration* — include modeling and demonstration by both teachers and peers; and
- *Student-Directed Activity*.

Why Did It Get Started?

The National Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence projects upon which this model is based were designed to establish a more culturally responsive educational system in Zuni Schools that is predicted to be associated with higher student achievement.

How Does It Work?

The model is based upon the seven standards of effective instruction described above and includes the primary components described below.

✎ *Teachers-Individual and Group Consultation*

This program is influencing teacher professional development through individual and group consultation with a site coordinator and a teacher professional development portfolio and evaluation process. There are three basic components of the consultation model, all based on a triadic model of assistance whereby program developers assist the staff advisor to assist teachers, and the staff advisor, in turn, assists teachers to assist students. First, the project staff advisor and university personnel collaboratively develop a systematic approach to provide individualized assistance to teachers. Second, the project staff advisor meets regularly with both individual and groups of teachers to discuss the standards and their enactment. And, finally, teachers attend 3 workshops annually and a single, 4-day Summer Institute at which teachers and community members work jointly to develop instructional units consistent with the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy and contextualized in local practices and values.

✎ *Annual Teacher Performance Evaluation - Professional Portfolio*

Evidence of competence in enacting the seven standards of effective instruction is included in the annual faculty evaluation. In addition, teachers build a professional development portfolio that includes the annual evaluation, results of classroom observations by research staff using the Activity Settings Observation System (ASOS), a videotaped lesson, and a development plan.

✎ *Parent-Teacher Focus Groups*

Parent-teacher focus groups conducted by the project staff advisor address issues of effective pedagogy and evaluate the seven standards in the context of the local community. The groups use a specific stimulus for each discussion, beginning with the Zuni enactment tapes, but rapidly expand to use participating teachers' own videotapes and portfolio items. The focus groups themselves will enact the generic standards; thus, the intervention will teach the generic standards by using them.

What Are The Costs?

Operating schools and classrooms according to this model entails no extra cost. The costs of training and staff development vary with the methods and intensity of the model.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

The primary means for reform is through teacher professional development and a professional development portfolio and evaluation process. Various activities for professional development, described below, have been employed and are available from the National Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence.

- *Professional Development Training and Support* is designed to develop professional competence in the Standards for Effective Pedagogy. While teachers and supervisors may aim toward mastery, others may need training at a level to discriminate, evaluate, or support the performance of others. Training and support are available for a variety of professionals: teachers, leaders, specialists, and policymakers. Training formats range from half-day sessions to year-long development packages, and are available for trainers or teachers.

- *Teaching Alive!* is a *CD-ROM* that has been created for use by teachers, teacher educators, school administrators, and researchers. It explains each of the standards and allows the user to view video clips of enactments of each.

- *A Professional Development Portfolio and Evaluation Process* includes a portfolio evaluation process and manual for teachers, intended to facilitate professional growth and authentic assessment of essential teaching competencies, is available.

- *Research Methods, Training and Materials* for a classroom observation system based in activity setting theory also are available. The Activity Setting Observation System (ASOS), instrumental in research or teacher professional development, determines the presence of classroom features aligned with the Standards for Effective Pedagogy.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

There are a wide variety of evaluation studies that have examined the effects on student performance when teachers use each of the standards separately. Evaluation of the fully organized five-standards enacted version is currently under way at the Zuni Middle School, Zuni, New Mexico.

Where Can I See It?

The CD-ROM *Teaching Alive!* is available through the National Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence for use by teachers, teacher educators, school administrators, and researchers. A school-wide application can be seen in a school reform

program at Zuni Middle School, Zuni, New Mexico. Visits are available only by advance arrangement.

Whom Do I Contact?

National Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence
1156 High Street
Santa Cruz, California 95064
Telephone: 408–459–3500; Fax: 408–459–3502
E-mail: crede@cats.ucsc.edu; Web site: http://www.crede.ucsc.edu

The Research Base

Traditional and contemporary Native American socialization emphasizes learning by observation. This observational learning is closely tied to the well-documented visual-learning patterns of Native children, and a holistic cognitive style. Observational learning has been related to the learning system of private, imagined practice, which allows for learning to occur without public failure (that is, competence before performance).

Numerous reports indicate that Native students are more inclined to participate in activities that they themselves generate, organize, or direct. Native students tend to be private learners and silent students, and resistant to the imposition of the practices and values of what they view as an alien institution. This is not surprising, for Native American cultures are distinctive in the degree of respect accorded to youthful autonomy and decision-making.

This project is based on an alternative organizational structure founded in a theory of schooling as assisted performance. In this organization, rather than functioning to direct and assess, the first responsibility of each person is to assist the performance of those in the next position to assist those in the third position. This triad is embedded in a longer chain of responsibility in which multiple triads exist. For example, program developers assist teacher educators to assist teachers, teacher educators assist teachers to assist students, and teachers assist students to assist peers.

Roots and Wings

What Is It?

Roots and Wings is a comprehensive, whole-school reform model designed to place a high floor under the basic skills achievement of all students while building problem-solving skills, creativity, and critical thinking. It builds on the extensively evaluated Success for All program, which provides research-based curricula for prekindergarten, kindergarten, and grades one through six reading, writing, and language arts; one-to-one tutoring for primary grade students struggling in reading; and extensive family support services. To these, Roots and Wings adds MathWings, a practical, constructivist approach to mathematics for grades one through five, and WorldLab, an integrated approach to social studies and science emphasizing simulations and group investigations.

Why Did It Get Started?

Roots and Wings was designed to complete the development of Success for All, extending it into all elementary subjects and grade levels. The program was initially funded by the New American Schools Development Corporation, a private foundation. This support enabled the project to develop and pilot MathWings and WorldLab, and to revise Success for All materials. Success for All is being used in more than 750 schools in 37 states; of these, about 80 add to Success for All either MathWings, WorldLab, or both.

How Does It Work?

Specific elements of the program are described below.

✎ *Reading, Writing, and Language Arts*

During daily 90-minute reading periods, students are regrouped by reading level across age lines. This eliminates the need for reading groups within the class. Tutors are used as reading teachers during reading time to reduce the size of reading classes. The reading program in kindergarten and the first grade uses phonetically regular storybooks supported by instruction that focuses on phonemic awareness, auditory discrimination, and sound blending.

At the second through fifth grade levels, students use school- or district-selected reading materials in a structured set of interactive opportunities to read, discuss, and write. This program emphasizes cooperative learning activities built around partner reading, story summarization, writing, and direct instruction in reading comprehension skills.

✎ *Tutors*

Specially trained certified teachers work one-on-one with any students who are failing to keep up with their classmates in reading. Priority is given to first grade students.

✎ *Eight-Week Assessments*

Students in grades one through six are assessed every 8 weeks to determine whether they are making adequate progress in reading. This information is used to assign students to tutoring, to suggest alternative teaching strategies in the regular reading classroom, and to make changes in reading group placement, family support interventions, or other means to meet student needs.

✎ *MathWings*

MathWings is a constructivist approach to mathematics for grades one through five. It is based on National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards and emphasizes mathematics concept development and problem-solving, as well as developing fluency in calculating. Cooperative learning is used at all levels to provide opportunities for students to develop their understanding of concepts by explaining them to each other in heterogeneous problem-solving groups and to enable feedback among students in teams. At the intermediate grade levels, Power Math allows students to work at their own pace on individualized units to reinforce learning in specific areas or to accelerate students into new areas.

✎ *WorldLab*

WorldLab is an integrated curriculum for social studies and science, grades one through five. In WorldLab, students work in small groups to engage in simulations and group investigations. Students take on roles as people in history, in various countries, or in various occupations. For example, they may experience, as early Americans, the conflicts that led to the writing of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

✎ *Cooperative Learning*

This is the vehicle that drives all Roots and Wings curricula. Students work together in partnerships and teams, helping one another to become strategic problem-solvers. Emphasis is placed on individual accountability, common goals, and recognition of team success.

✎ *Facilitators*

A full-time facilitator works with teachers in each Roots and Wings school to help them implement the reading program. The facilitator also helps implement the 8-week assessments, assists the Family Support Team, plans and implements staff development, and works with teachers to ensure that every child is making adequate progress.

✎ *Family Support Team*

The Family Support Team, composed of the principal or assistant principal, facilitator, social worker, and other building personnel, works with parents to help ensure the success of their children. The team focuses on promoting parent involvement, developing plans to meet the needs of students having difficulty with tardiness and attendance, and integrating community and school resources to benefit students.

What Are The Costs?

Roots and Wings is typically funded by reallocations of existing Title I, state compensatory, and special education funds in high-poverty schools. The program facilitator and tutors required by the program generally come from existing school personnel, such as Title I-funded teachers. Costs for materials and training vary according to school size and other factors, but average $60,000 to $70,000 during the first year for a school of 500 students.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

The elements of Roots and Wings are typically phased in over a 3-year period. Most schools begin with Success for All in the first year, then add MathWings and WorldLab, although schools can begin in any order and can, if they choose, implement Success for All, MathWings, or WorldLab without the other elements. For each component, all teachers receive detailed manuals supplemented by 3 days of in-service at the beginning of the school year provided by Roots and Wings trainers. Throughout the year, follow-up visits are made to the school by project trainers, who visit classrooms, provide coaching, meet with school staff, and conduct in service presentations on such topics as classroom management, instructional pace, and cooperative learning.

Prior to adopting Roots and Wings, district and building administrators, teachers, and parents are encouraged to review program materials, view videotapes, and visit nearby Roots and Wings school sites. A school entering the program must have a vote of 80 percent or more of its staff in support of adoption.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Research on Roots and Wings has found substantial positive effects of the program in all curricular areas. On the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP), students in four high-poverty pilot schools in rural St. Mary's County gained significantly more than other Maryland students in reading, writing, language, social studies, and science from 1993 to 1996. These schools, in which 48 percent of students qualified for free lunch, began far below state averages, but by 1996 were scoring at or above state averages in all subjects at grades three and five.

In addition, a substantial body of research has established the effectiveness of Success for All, the reading, writing, and language arts components of Roots and Wings. The results of these evaluations indicate that the program clearly increases reading performance, especially for students who perform in the lowest 25 percent of their class. Evaluations over time in 11 school districts find that, on average, Success for All students score about 3 months higher than control groups in first grade, and 1.1 years higher in fifth grade on reading measures. Studies of MathWings in Texas, Florida, and Maryland have found positive effects of that program component.

Roots and Wings has been implemented successfully in schools with very diverse student populations. It is being employed by schools with 100 percent African-American student bodies, and schools with predominantly Hispanic, limited-English-speaking populations. The model is being used in inner-city schools in several large cities, as well as a broad range of rural schools.

Where Can I See It?

Demonstration sites are available in many parts of the United States. Contact the Roots and Wings program for the nearest sites.

Whom Do I Contact?

Roots and Wings Program
Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Telephone: 800–548–4998; Fax: 410–516–0543
E-mail: bcoppersm@csos.jhu.edu; Website: http://www.csos.jhu.edu/sfa/sfa.html

The Research Base

Roots and Wings is composed of elements that have been researched and are known to be highly effective. The reading, writing, tutoring, early childhood, family support and assessment elements of Root and Wings are adapted from Success for All, a whole school reform model which has been extensively evaluated and found to consistently increase achievement and reduce special education placements. Both the WorldLab and MathWings curriculum are designed around research suggesting that the elementary curriculum should be useful and relevant to children's everyday lives, and should foster active learning and the development of higher order thinking skills.

School Change Model:
Basic Principles for School Reform in a Bilingual Context

What Is It?

The School Change Model is an approach to school-wide reform that aims at improving achievement and other student outcomes by creating a coherent and focused school-wide effort. Although it was developed in a predominantly Latino school with an existing bilingual education program, the model's principles are probably equally applicable in other situations. The model does not describe a specific instructional program. Rather, it identifies four key "change elements" that educators can use to help bring about positive changes in teaching and learning at a school:

- *Goals* that are set and shared,
- *Indicators* that measure success,
- *Assistance* by capable others, and
- *Leadership* that supports and pressures.

Why Did It Get Started?

The School Change Model was the result of a collaborative project between a university researcher and an elementary school principal who wanted to improve student achievement at a predominantly Latino school, Freeman Elementary School, in Los Angeles. The project began in 1990–91. The School Change Model is currently being tested with a cluster of schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

How Does It Work?

The process begins with teachers and leadership setting shared, specific learning goals and expectations for students (in a chosen academic area). It continues with the development and analysis of key indicators of student achievement in relation to the goals. The indicators can include, for example, grade-level designation of reading texts that students are reading, performance-based assessments, or standardized achievement measures. The change process is sustained by teachers in groups routinely and jointly studying lessons and examining student work and indicators of achievement (teacher groups focus on learning and exploring better teaching methods to help accomplish school-wide goals and evaluating the effects of ongoing efforts). Supportive and pressuring leadership maintains focus and momentum.

A critical concept is the *setting,* which is defined as any instance in which two or more people come together in new relationships over a sustained period of time in order to achieve certain goals. School improvement takes place in specific and concrete settings where people meet to create a focused, coherent, and sustained effort to improve student learning. The four change elements in the model—goals, indicators, assistance, and leadership—create the dynamics for change within and across these settings. Relevant settings include the following.

- *Academic Expectations Committee* — representatives from faculty and leadership meet to set and share learning goals and expectations for students (1–2 years).

- *Academic Assessment Committee* — representatives learn about, develop, and implement and help others to implement indicators of student learning tied to the goals.

- *Staff Meetings* — school personnel can see the "big picture" of the school's change efforts, receive reports of progress and emergent issues, hear about and analyze strategic data regarding student performance on key indicators (at least yearly), and receive training and relevant information for improving teaching and learning.

- *Grade-Level Meetings* — teachers (1) discuss grade-specific issues related to implementation of goals and assessments; and (2) bring in samples of student work they have collected as part of ongoing assessment practices to analyze, score, and discuss.

- *Teacher Workgroups* — small groups of teachers organized around any topic related to the school's efforts to improve student outcomes, e.g., reading, writing, or math instruction, parent involvement, cooperative learning. The groups meet approximately weekly to study lessons, examine student work, interpret data on indicators of student learning, or evaluate the success of specific improvement efforts in their chosen area.

- *Consultant-Principal Meetings* — the principal meets with the consultant to plan strategies and meeting agendas, address issues, coordinate change efforts school-wide, and help maintain focus and coherence.

What Are The Costs?

Costs will vary by size of school and number and duration of meetings and workgroups, as well as costs of substitutes and aides to cover classrooms. Major cost items on a yearly basis (with very approximate figures assuming a faculty of 30 teachers) include: a consultant or outside "assister" to meet with the principal and key committees approximately once per week ($10,000 to $15,000); release time for teachers on committees ($4,000 to $5,000) and in workgroups ($6,000 to $7,500); photocopying for goals, expectations, assessments, reporting of results, etc. ($2,000 to $3,000). Materials to assist implementation, such as a video, project write-ups, and assessment materials are available at cost.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Presently there is no implementation infrastructure. Research on the School Change Model is under way to see if it provides a viable, large-scale approach to school improvement. Interested educators are invited to contact the project directors for additional information and to discuss implementation.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

The School Change Model enables educators to create a focused and coherent school-wide effort aimed at improving student achievement in specific, targeted areas of the curriculum. Freeman students have surpassed the rest of the district in language arts achievement, and in some areas have matched or surpassed state and national norms. For example, in 1990, 31 percent of Freeman's first graders were on grade level on nationally normed standardized tests of Spanish reading; and in third grade, 61 percent of the cohort was reading at least at grade level. In contrast, 41 percent of first graders in the rest of the district were reading on grade level in Spanish in 1990; and in third grade, only 49 percent of these students were on grade level.

There has also been progress in English reading. In 1989 and 1990, Freeman students scored below the state and district on California State Department of Education English reading tests. By 1993, in contrast, 28 percent of Freeman fourth graders scored at the highest levels (4 and above on a 6-point measure), compared to 17 percent of students in the rest of the district and 30 percent state-wide. Freeman students also report reading more. In 1992, Freeman students in grades two through five reported that they had read voluntarily only 5.3 items (books, magazines, stories, etc.) during the previous year, while in the rest of the district, students reported reading 9.5 items. In 1995, Freeman students reported reading on their own an average of 13 items over the preceding year; students in the other district schools averaged slightly more than 7.

In teacher interviews and surveys (comparing Freeman to comparable elementary schools), Freeman faculty report significant changes at the school. Teachers say that they have worked together on school-wide goals that are being used to help improve student achievement; that they regularly receive assistance, support, and training; and that strong school-level leadership has been instrumental in promoting constructive changes.

Where Can I See It?

The only project sites are in the Los Angeles area. A videotape is available from the developer.

Whom Do I Contact?

Claude Goldenberg or Bill Saunders
Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence
The California State University, Long Beach
Department of Teacher Education
1250 Bellflower Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90840
Telephone: 562–985–4443 (Goldenberg) or 310–536–0156 (Saunders)
Fax: 562–985–1774 (Goldenberg)
E-mail: cgolden@ucla.edu or bsaunder@ucla.edu

The Research Base

The aim of the School Change Model is to provide overall coherence to a school's efforts to improve achievement and other student outcomes. It provides a focus for unifying the different activities and initiatives at the school under a common purpose. The model is derived from the research on effective schools and educational change.

Recent research supports the idea that common and mutually understood goals are vital for successful change efforts. Motivation theory suggests that goal-setting matters because goals affect behavior; teachers who adopt shared and generally understood goals for student learning are likely to take concrete steps to accomplish these goals. Indicators of success are used in assessing student progress toward goals and themselves help produce improvement in student outcomes. Indicators complement goals by reinforcing the goals' importance and helping to gauge progress. Assistance is also key to successful change. Recent research highlights the importance of mutual assistance among staff developers, administrators, and fellow professionals.

The School Change Model places emphasis on presenting information, creating settings that encourage discussion and analysis, and providing opportunities to attempt and reflect upon new behaviors that will assist teachers in accomplishing student learning goals. Finally, leadership is the element most closely associated with efforts to make schools more effective. In the context of the three other change elements—goals, indicators, and assistance—leadership produces a tension between pressuring on the one hand and supporting on the other. The skillful principal will know when to exercise one or the other or both simultaneously. Together, the four change elements create a dynamic that can lead to positive changes and improved student outcomes.

Schoolwide Enrichment Model

What Is It?

The Schoolwide Enrichment Model is based upon a vision that "schools are places for talent development." The model uses the pedagogy of gifted education to make school more challenging and enjoyable for all students. The Schoolwide Enrichment Model "blueprint" for total school improvement serves as a practical plan for K–12 teachers and administrators to make this vision a reality. While detailed enough to provide educators with the means to successfully implement the program, the model provides the flexibility for each school to develop its own unique program in accordance with local resources, student population, and faculty interests and strengths. Two major objectives of the Schoolwide Enrichment Model include: providing a broad range of advanced-level enrichment experiences for all students and using student responses to these experiences as stepping stones for relevant follow-up.

Why Did It Get Started?

The Schoolwide Enrichment Model evolved from Joseph Renzulli's original Enrichment Triad Model, developed in the mid-1970s and initially implemented in school districts in New England. A wider interest developed, and districts across the country adopted the model. A need for research to investigate why the model was working and how to further expand the theoretical rationale underlying the model was apparent, thus initiating almost 20 years of field testing, research, and dissemination. Used as a basis for many educational programs for high-ability and high-achieving students over the years, the Enrichment Triad Model evolved into the current Schoolwide Enrichment Model, which is intended for enrichment for all children and total school implementation and improvement. The model's roots in gifted education programs is indeed a positive feature, because such programs, unencumbered by prescribed curricular and instructional methods, have proven to be a fertile ground for experimentation with school improvement concepts.

How Does It Work?

Bringing the Schoolwide Enrichment Model to large segments of the school population requires three essential elements:

✎ *The Total Talent Portfolio*

Students complete various instruments and contribute their best work samples to reflect their strengths and interests as learners. Documenting their abilities, interests, and learning style preferences allows for appropriate decision-making in all curricular areas. This information focuses on students' strengths rather than their deficits, and is used by schools to decide which talent development opportunities to offer particular students.

✎ *Curriculum Modification Techniques*

The Schoolwide Enrichment Model encourages the development of a challenging curriculum, and one that injects both in-depth and enrichment learning experiences into regular school activities. Curriculum modification may be necessary, and can be done through textbook analysis, curriculum compacting (elimination of repetitive or previously mastered material, improvement of the challenge level of the regular curriculum, and provision of time for enrichment and acceleration activities), and an expansion of the depth of learning (a focus on representative topics and ideas, and an emphasis on students' roles as firsthand investigators).

✎ *Enrichment Learning and Teaching*

The development of the school program should be based upon the following principles of enrichment learning and teaching:

- Each learner is unique.
- Learning is more effective when students enjoy what they are doing.
- Learning is more meaningful and enjoyable when content and process are learned within the context of a real and present problem.
- Some formal instruction may be used, but a major goal is to enhance knowledge and thinking-skills acquisition through inductive teaching and the application of knowledge and skills that result from students' construction of meaning.

The above three elements of the Schoolwide Enrichment Model can operate within three types of school structures:

- *Regular Curriculum* — The goal of Schoolwide Enrichment Model is to enhance, rather than replace, the regular curriculum through integration of curriculum modification and differentiation and the Enrichment Triad Model: Type I (general exploratory activities), Type II (individual and group skill and process training activities), and Type III (individual and small group investigations of real problems).
- *Enrichment Clusters* — Enrichment Clusters are multi-age groups of students who meet regularly with a facilitator to share and pursue a common interest. Clusters, which revolve around major disciplines, interdisciplinary themes, or cross-disciplinary topics, emphasize the development of higher-order thinking skills and the creative and productive application of these skills to real-world situations.

- *Continuum of Special Services* — Supplementary services including individual or small group counseling, mentor relationships, and direct assistance in facilitating advanced-level work, are essential for a talent development program to be effective in meeting the needs of individual students.

What Are The Costs?

Costs will vary in each school, but should include provisions for salary and materials for a part-time Enrichment Specialist (one full-time Specialist is recommended in larger schools), professional development ($3,000 to $4,000), and general program implementation expenses (between $3,000 and $5,000). Professional development involves a 2-week summer training program at the University of Connecticut, which is usually attended by a team of faculty members who then serve as an enrichment team and as peer coaches.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Change should be initiated, nurtured, and monitored within the school. The Schoolwide Enrichment Model does not replace existing school structures, but seeks to improve them by concentrating on internal and external factors that have a direct bearing on learning. The procedure for adoption and implementation of the model calls for ownership and involvement of staff, administration, and parents. Implementation steps include team-building through steering committees and discussion groups; familiarization with the model by all involved; a decision to embrace the Schoolwide Enrichment Model concepts; development of a mission statement, proposal, and time line for the school; and formation of a Schoolwide Enrichment Team to guide the implementation of the Model.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

The Schoolwide Enrichment Model is a product of 15 years of research and field testing. The model has been implemented in school districts worldwide, and extensive evaluations and research studies indicate the effectiveness of the model. The review of the research on the Schoolwide Enrichment Model is subdivided into (a) the effectiveness of the model as perceived by key groups, (b) research related to creative productivity, (c) research relating to personal and social development, (d) the use of the model with underserved populations, (e) research on self-efficacy, (f) the use of the Schoolwide Enrichment Model as a curricular framework, (g) research relating to learning styles and curriculum compacting, and (h) longitudinal research on the model. Research suggests that the model is effective at serving students in a variety of educational settings and in schools that serve diverse ethnic and socioeconomic populations.

Where Can I See It?

Hundreds of school districts in urban, rural, and suburban districts throughout the United States, as well as in other countries, are implementing the Schoolwide Enrichment Model. Contact the National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented at the University of Connecticut to locate nearby visitation sites.

Whom Do I Contact?

National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented
University of Connecticut
362 Fairfield Road, U–7
Storrs, Connecticut 06269–2007
Telephone: 860– 486–4676; Fax: 860–486–2900
E-mail: epsadm06@uconnvm.uconn.edu; Website: http://www.gifted.uconn.edu

The Research Base

Three principal bodies of research have influenced the development of the Schoolwide Enrichment Model. First, the model is designed around the body of research evidence indicating that instruction must take into account the varying abilities, background interests, experiences, and learning styles of each student. Secondly, learning is more meaningful and enjoyable when content and process are learned within the context of a real problem and when students use authentic methods to address the problem. Finally, the model builds on research suggesting that all students, including low income students, need to be provided with challenging and accelerated learning content. Learning experiences are therefore designed with the goal to engage and offer stimulation and enjoyment to all students.

Success For All

What Is It?

Success for All is a structured whole school reform model focusing on students in grades pre-kindergarten through grade six. The model is designed to raise the achievement of students in low-performing schools. The idea behind Success for All is to use everything known from research on effective instruction for students in low-performing schools to prevent and intervene in the development of learning problems in the early years. A principle thrust is to ensure that every child in the school succeeds in learning to read at grade level by the end of the third grade. In addition to reading programs, Success for All provides one-to-one tutoring for primary-aged children struggling in reading, family support services, and other elements. A bilingual Spanish version of the program, called "Lee Conmigo," has been developed.

Why Did It Get Started?

Success for All grew out of a partnership between the Baltimore City Public Schools and what is now the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk at Johns Hopkins University. The Baltimore school board president and superintendent of schools challenged the research team at the Center to develop a program that would enable every child in an inner-city Baltimore elementary school to perform at grade level in reading by the end of grade three. The program was first implemented during the 1987–88 school year in Baltimore. By fall 1997, Success for All had been implemented in more than 750 schools in 37 states throughout the country.

How Does It Work?

Specific elements of the program are described below.

✎ *Reading, Writing, and Language Arts*

During daily 90-minute reading periods, students are regrouped by reading level across age lines. This eliminates the need for reading groups within the class and increases the amount of time for direct instruction. Tutors are used as reading teachers during reading time to reduce the size of reading classes. The reading program in kindergarten and first grade uses phonetically regular storybooks supported by careful instruction that focuses on phonemic awareness, auditory discrimination, and sound blending. The storybooks' contents focus on narrative and expository themes of interest to young children. Students become fluent as they read to each other in pairs.

At the second through fifth grade levels, students use school- or district-selected reading materials in a carefully structured set of interactive opportunities to read, discuss, and write. This program emphasizes cooperative learning activities built around partner reading, story

summarization, writing, and direct instruction in reading comprehension skills. A writing and language arts approach based on writing process methods engages students in planning, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing compositions in a variety of genres. Language mechanics skills are taught in close connection with composition.

✎ *Cooperative Learning*

This is the vehicle that drives the Success for All curriculum. Students work together in partnerships and teams, helping one another to become strategic readers and writers. Emphasis is placed on individual accountability, common goals, and recognition of team success.

✎ *Tutors*

Specially trained certified teachers work one-on-one with any students who are failing to keep up with their classmates in reading. Priority is given to first grade students.

✎ *Facilitators*

A full-time facilitator works with teachers in each Success for All school to help them implement the reading program. The facilitator also helps implement the 8-week assessments, assists the Family Support Team, plans and implements staff development, and works with teachers to ensure that every child is making adequate progress.

✎ *Eight-Week Assessments*

Students in grades one through six are assessed every 8 weeks to determine whether they are making adequate progress in reading. This information is used to assign students to tutoring, to suggest alternative teaching strategies in the regular reading classroom, and to make changes in reading group placement, family support interventions, or other means to meet student needs.

✎ *Family Support Team*

The Family Support Team, composed of the principal or assistant principal, facilitator, social worker, and other building personnel, works with parents to help ensure the success of their children. The team focuses on promoting parent involvement, developing plans to meet the needs of students having difficulty with tardiness and attendance, and integrating community and school resources to benefit students.

What Are The Costs?

Success for All is typically funded by reallocations of existing Title I, state compensatory, and special education funds in high-poverty schools. The program facilitator and tutors required by the program generally come from existing school personnel, such as Title I-funded teachers.

Costs for materials and training vary according to school size and other factors, but average between $60,000 and $70,000 during the first year for a school of 500 students. This figure drops to approximately $25,000 in the second year.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

All teachers receive a detailed teacher's manual supplemented by 3 days of in service at the beginning of the school year provided by Success for All trainers. Throughout the year, follow-up visits are made to the school by project trainers who visit classrooms, meet with school staff, and conduct in service presentations on such topics as classroom management, instructional pace, and cooperative learning. The staff development model used in Success for All emphasizes relatively brief initial training with extensive classroom follow-up, coaching, and group discussion. The building facilitator also organizes informal sessions to allow teachers to share problems, suggest changes, and discuss individual children.

Prior to adopting Success for All, district and building administrators, teachers, and parents are encouraged to review program materials, view videotapes, and visit nearby Success for All school sites. A school entering the program must have the vote of 80 percent or more of its staff in support of adoption of the model.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

From the very beginning, there has been a strong focus in Success for All on research and evaluation. The results of these evaluations indicate that the program clearly increases reading performance, especially for students who perform in the lowest 25 percent of their class. Compared to control groups, Success for All students score about 3 months higher in first grade, and 1.1 years higher in fifth grade on reading measures. The most dramatic research finding is that a school's reading performance tends to progressively increase with each successive year of program implementation. Evaluations also indicate positive impacts on the achievement of limited-English proficient students and students who have been assigned to special education. Retentions and special education placements decline significantly in Success for All schools.

Success for All has been implemented successfully in schools with tremendously diverse student populations. It is being employed by schools with 100 percent African-American student bodies; schools with predominantly Hispanic student populations representing different Hispanic groups, both native or immigrant to this country; schools with large numbers of Asian students; and integrated schools. The model is being used in inner-city schools in several large cities across the country, as well as in a broad range of rural schools.

Where Can I See It?

Demonstration sites are available in many parts of the United States. Contact the Success for All program for the nearest sites.

Whom Do I Contact?

Success for All Program
Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Telephone: 800–548–4998; Fax: 410–516–0543
E-mail: bcoppersm@csos.jhu.edu; Website: http://www.csos.jhu.edu/sfa/sfa.html

The Research Base

The Success for All model is predicated on research evidence stressing the importance of early academic success. Success for All incorporates a number of prevention and intervention strategies designed to ensure all children in a school develop strong foundations in reading by third grade. The model calls for one-half day prekindergarten and full day kindergarten, and provides developmentally appropriate curriculum emphasizing school readiness in the areas of language development, self esteem and prosocial skills. Research suggests that a strong emphasis on school readiness and the development of pre reading skills at the preschool level is critical to school success for poor children many of whom do not have the opportunity to developed them prior to beginning school.

In the early elementary grades, Success for All focuses relentlessly on providing ample time and resources for children to gain strong skills in reading by the third grade. The intention here is to prevent students from being retained in grade, or placed in special education programs or remedial education. Research suggests that these traditional "remedies" to poor performance in reading have little or no positive effect on student achievement.

The Success for All curriculum makes generous use of cooperative learning which has proved itself to be effective in strengthening students' academic as well as social skills. The Success for All staff development component is consistent with research on adult learning indicating that professional development should be focused and provide for frequent follow-up.

Talent Development High School with Career Academies

What Is It?

The Talent Development High School with Career Academies is a comprehensive multi-phased reform model for large high schools that have serious problems of student attendance, discipline, achievement scores, and dropout rates. The model is specific in the required school organization and curriculum changes, in contrast to other high school reform recommendations that emphasize general principles to be achieved or the reform process to be followed. Nevertheless, there is ample room for local adaptations and contributions in the Talent Development High School Model to fit local conditions and to earn local ownership. The first phase of Talent Development High School reforms involves changes in school organization and management to establish a safe and serious climate for learning and to motivate regular attendance by students and staff. The second phase, includes improvements in curriculum and classroom instruction to better engage students in their own learning and to produce greater growth in student achievement of higher-order learning goals.

Why Did It Get Started?

At the invitation of the Maryland State Department of Education, Patterson High School in Baltimore—one of two high schools to be named eligible for reconstitution (state takeover)—and the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk (CRESPAR) at Johns Hopkins University began to work together to design and evaluate reforms to turn the school around. After a planning year in 1994–95, the first-phase Talent Development High School Model with Career Academies was implemented in 1995–96 at Patterson High School. A year later, the model began implementation at a high school site in Washington, DC under the auspices of CRESPAR at Howard University. Currently, several other schools in five big city districts across the nation are implementing the model.

How Does It Work?

Specific elements of the program are described below.

✎ *Ninth Grade Success Academy*

A separate transitional program is provided for students in their first year of high school that places them with small interdisciplinary teams of 4 or 5 teachers who share the same 150 to 180 students and a block schedule with common planning time. This unit has its own part of the building with its own clearly labeled entrance, including the computer and science labs needed for ninth grade courses. A separate management team (the Academy Principal and Academy Instructional Leader) is in charge of the Ninth Grade Success Academy.

Major responsibility for finding solutions to individual student attendance, discipline, and learning problems rests with the teacher teams, where each has a Team Leader and uses regular data to set goals and monitor trends in student behavior. Good student attendance becomes a priority to set the foundation for serious student work to earn promotion on time to the next grade. Numerous activities are structured throughout the first term to prepare students to make a wise choice of program for their final three high school years, through extensive self-awareness opportunities concerning career goals and interests, and the provision of detailed information on high school choices and college alternatives. Students then select a Career Academy for the next 3 years.

✎ *Career Academies for the Upper Grades*

Self-contained Career Academies are formed to enroll 250 to 350 students in grades 10, 11, and 12. The Career Academies are developed by the school faculty based on instructional strengths, labor market opportunities, and a mix of Academies to cover the major broad career clusters and student personalities. Each Career Academy offers the same common core of demanding academic courses with an appropriate blend of career applications to match the particular Academy theme, so college entrance as well as entry to work is possible from every Career Academy. Each has its own separate part of the building with a unique entrance; its own faculty for both basic academic courses and Career-focused electives; and its own management team of Academy Principal and Academy Instructional Leader (drawn from previous school-wide Vice Principals and Department Chairs) with major authority for student discipline, instruction, and curriculum. Guidance counselors are also assigned to each Career Academy.

Depending upon their size, schools can have from two to six or more Career Academies. For example, Patterson has Career Academies in Arts and Humanities, Business and Finance, Environmental Sciences, Sports Studies and Health Wellness, and Transportation and Manufacturing Technology. Each Career Academy develops two or three pathways that provide instruction and internships for more specific sets of occupations within the Academy theme.

✎ *Core Curriculum in a Four-Period Day*

A basic set of college preparatory academic courses is required for all students across the 4 years of high school, which are scheduled along with electives in a 4-period day for two 18-week terms per school year. The curriculum in the ninth grade features double time in mathematics and English for students who have weak prior preparations, and multiple assessment methods to recognize improvements as well as achievements in learning. Staff development is extensive for teachers on the use of the 90-minute class period, incorporation of technology into instruction, familiarity with a variety of learning activities to engage students in higher-order competencies, and development of departmental exams to establish uniform coverage and external evaluations in common courses. Summer school, Saturday school, and After-hours Credit school are offered so that students can recover from course failures and missed credits can be earned.

✎ *Twilight School*

An alternative after-hours program is conducted in the building for students who have serious attendance or discipline problems or who are coming to the school from prison or suspension from another school. Instruction is offered in small classes in the basic subjects, and extensive services are provided by guidance and support staff. The goal is for students to earn their way back to regular day school after a 4- or 5-week period by developing coping skills to be successful there.

What Are The Costs?

Planning year and implementation year costs will vary widely, due to school configurations and availability of staff development and planning time. Redesign of entrances and space for the Academies must be covered, as well as career interest inventories for students, and teacher time to plan Academies and receive workshops in teaming and extended-period instruction. Additional management team leaders for each Academy may need to be added to staff if redistribution of Vice Principals and Department Chairs is insufficient. Technical assistance materials and support can be provided by district sources, but may also involve added costs.

A general estimate can be made of 1 to 2 percent of total school budget as additional annual costs to plan and implement the management and school organization phases of the Talent Development High School Model. The costs of the second phase involving redesigned curriculum and instruction will depend upon a school's current availability of technology and annual budget for new books, instructional materials, and staff development, but is likely to be on the order of 3 to 5 percent of the total budget in additional costs.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

A school with initial interest in the model can view videos from Patterson High School and inspect a prospectus that describes essential components of the model and expected commitments of new Talent Development High School sites. This can be followed by an Application Process in which the school engages in some serious initial planning to outline its local Talent Development High School design. If the plan is acceptable, arrangements can be made for liaison personnel at the school, technical assistance, and support networks, and a schedule for further planning and implementation is established.

What Is The Evidence That It Is Successful?

The Talent Development High School with Career Academies has significant positive effects on school climate, student attendance and promotion-graduation rates when these outcomes are compared to previous years at Patterson, as well as to other non-selective high schools in Baltimore. After implementation, teacher ratings about the seriousness of tardiness, student

fights, vandalism, absenteeism, student apathy, drug use, physical and verbal abuse of teachers, student lack of career focus or lack of knowledge about college, and class cutting all decreased dramatically at Patterson, but not at a comparison school. Teacher attitudes about student misbehavior and school discipline became dramatically more positive at Patterson, but not at the comparison school. Most teachers believe that their school climate is somewhat better or much better at Patterson.

Student perceptions of climate are also much better, compared to student perceptions in the comparison school. Significant improvements in student attendance occurred at Patterson, far exceeding any improvements in attendance occurring at the comparison school. The promotion rate at Patterson at the end of the 1995–96 school year exceeded the promotion rate of the comparison school. Patterson made its greatest strides in increasing the numbers of ninth graders who earned promotion to the tenth grade.

Where Can I See It?

Patterson High School is in Baltimore, Maryland.

Whom Do I Contact?

James M. McPartland, Co-director,
Talent Development High School Program,
Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Telephone: 410–516–8800; Fax: 410–516–8890
E-mail: jmcpartlan@csos.jhu.edu; Website: http://www.csos.jhu.edu/talent/high.html

The Research Base

Research has defined a framework of four basic motivational components that all students need in their schools: relevance of schoolwork, a caring and supportive human environment, opportunities for academic success, and help with personal problems. Research on students placed at risk finds that schools often fail to address the special circumstances of the student's economic, family, community, and minority status. Recent studies have examined and expanded upon the four motivational sources and described how high schools can address each through changes in school organization, curriculum, and instructional practice. Extensive research on the framework and the development of processes and practices that support it are the basis for the Talent Development High School Model and its components.

Talent Development Middle School

What Is It?

The Talent Development Middle School whole school reform model is based on the belief that all students can learn challenging material if the right types of support are given. The model reorganizes and restructures the organization, curriculum, and instruction of a middle school in order to hold all students to high standards, but provide multiple pathways, supports and research-based practices that ensure their success.

Why Did It Get Started?

The Talent Development Middle School model puts into practice the best of research on middle school practices and programs conducted over the past few decades. Many middle school practices and structures have been advocated based on research findings, but few have been actually implemented in middle schools, and few middle schools have developed whole-school approaches based on the research. The Talent Development Middle School model developed by the Center for Research on Students Placed At Risk was first implemented at Central East Middle School in Philadelphia during the 1995–96 school year. Central East is a middle school with about 1,000 students in grades five through eight, most of them from low income, minority backgrounds. The model began implementation in a Washington, DC middle school in the 1996–97 school year. Currently, the model is expanding to several other middle schools in Philadelphia.

How Does It Work?

The essential components for the Talent Development Middle school include:

- A demanding *standards-based core curriculum* aimed at active student learning is provided for all students in *heterogeneously grouped classes.*
- Opportunities for extra help and enrichment are expanded through the use of *cooperative learning* and *"extra dose" elective classes* in mathematics and reading.
- A *communal organization* of the school is established that includes semi-departmentalization, two- or three-person interdisciplinary teams, and small learning communities that endure for 2 or 3 years.
- Students are assisted every year in setting goals, planning for the future, and systematically exploring educational and career options through a *Career Exploration and Educational Decision Making course* that meets weekly.

- An *intensive transition program* (involving eighth graders as "older partners") ensures a good start for students who are new to the school.

- *Growth-oriented evaluation practices* are used that recognize individual improvement and progress toward high standards, in addition to giving students realistic feedback about how their performance compares to national norms and performance standards.

- *Students are assisted with personal problems and concerns* such as substance abuse, teenage parenthood, home difficulties, or poor attendance habits, by integrating professional services at the school and through coordinated efforts by each student's small learning community.

- *School-family-community partnerships* are established.

- Instruction is attentive to *cultural patterns and norms*, promotes *cultural literacy*, and helps students connect to and interpret *cultural traditions*.

What Are The Costs?

Costs for the Talent Development Middle School Model are primarily associated with curriculum and instructional materials, professional staff development, and personnel. The school employs a high-standards-based curriculum for all students in all subject areas, and costs will vary depending upon how the school's current curriculum resources can be used. Schools may need to phase in changes in curriculum, due to the costs involved. Costs in reading and language arts include purchases of high-quality demanding novels and Student Team Literature materials. Staff development includes the costs of teacher stipends for approximately 36 hours over a full year. Finally, a full-time program facilitator based at the school is needed, although this person may be someone who is already on staff. Costs to implement the model will vary from 1 percent to 3 percent of a school's operating budget depending upon how the school's resources can be used.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

A carefully structured reform process is used for the implementation of the Talent Development Middle School Model. This process involves the school staff in key decision-making roles and provides them with effective support systems for making necessary changes in school organization and classroom instructional practices.

The school's local school improvement team is provided with a detailed prospectus on the Talent Development Middle School Model that describes the components of the model and the conditions required for implementation. Other awareness materials are also available. The school improvement team is given the opportunity to visit a demonstration site so that they can

decide if they wish to become a Talent Development Middle School with the associated reform requirements and responsibilities. The decision to become a Talent Development Middle School requires agreement by no less than 80 percent of the entire school staff.

At the implementation stage, the principal and teachers of the first Talent Development Middle School in a district engage in an extensive planning effort with technical assistance from the Talent Development Middle School program at the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk. This partnership continues through the first year of implementation to provide feedback on the required reform components and their effects. When additional schools in a district or locality decide to adopt the Talent Development Middle School Model, once the first demonstration site has been successful, a scaling-up network is formed with these schools and the demonstration site, with continuing follow up technical assistance provided by the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk or an authorized representative. This scaling-up network guides and supports the establishment of the additional Talent Development Middle School sites in the district.

What Is The Evidence That It Is Successful?

Implementation and outcome information have been collected to examine the initial effects of the Talent Development Middle School innovations at Central East Middle School in Philadelphia. The effects of implementing the essential components of the Talent Development Middle School model are being carefully evaluated at Central East Middle School by comparing student outcomes there to those obtained in a closely matched control school.

An assessment of motivational outcomes indicates that the language arts program called Student Team Literature implementation has produced reading, English and language arts classrooms where peer support for achievement is high, where student-teacher relations are positive, students give their best and work hard to master the content and meet adults' standards, and students are confident both in their ability to learn and in the future utility of what they are learning.

Analyses of the impact of the Talent Development Middle School Model on student achievement after 1 year of implementation indicate that students at Central East Middle school performed much better on the Stanford 9 in May 1996 than did students in the comparison school (controlling for students' scores from the previous year). For example, the adjusted mean reading comprehension scale score at Central East Middle School was one-half of a standard deviation higher than at the comparison school. The typical student in the typical classroom achieved an adjusted scale score that was about 11 points higher at Central East than the comparison school. This is equivalent to more than a whole extra year's worth of growth in reading comprehension.

In mathematics, the first year of Talent Development Middle School implementation focused on helping students who were behind to catch up quickly by offering them an extra dose of intensive instruction in mathematics in addition to their regular mathematics course. This approach had a

big payoff—the adjusted mean mathematics procedures scale score in May 1996 (controlling for students' starting points) was 10 points higher at Central East than at the comparison school. There was also a positive but smaller effect on mathematics problem-solving (five scale score points). We have also found initial evidence of powerful effects of the Talent Development Model on student and staff attendance, and on students' promotion rates, occupational understanding, and belief in the importance of making career plans during the middle school years.

Where Can I See It?

Central East Middle School, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Whom Do I Contact?

Talent Development Middle School Program
Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Telephone: 410–516–8800; Fax: 410–516–8890
E-mail: dmaciver@csos.jhu.edu

The Research Base

The Talent Development Middle School approach to helping greater numbers of students succeed in middle school is based on research illustrating that all students can learn challenging material if the right types of support are given. The components of the approach are based upon recent research on alternatives to tracking, effective practices in middle school education, and clear theories about and research pertaining to how to foster the positive relationships and supportive conditions that are so important at this time in students' lives.

The 1990s have produced many promising efforts and research studies aimed at nurturing and educating middle school students that are especially relevant to urban schools serving large numbers of students placed at risk. A first set of efforts includes the development and use of cooperative learning methods that embed peer tutoring into the daily routine of classroom life and that create positive peer pressure and peer support for achievement. A second set includes detracking and an awareness of the course sequences and gateways that have been highly influential in sorting students and determining future opportunities. A third set includes semi-departmentalization and interdisciplinary teams of teachers. The components and the philosophy of the Talent Development Middle school are derived from practice and research in these areas.

Three-Year Transition Program for Native Spanish-Speaking Elementary Students

What Is It?

This 3-year program provides a sustained approach to Spanish and English development that cultivates and builds on primary language skills and personal and cultural experiences. The program is a combination of:

- The Three-Year Transition Program involving three explicit phases: Pre-Transition, Transition I, and Transition II (optimally, grades three through five); and

- A specific language arts model for the middle and upper elementary grades, including 12 specific components built around the study of literature.

The language arts model establishes continuity of curriculum and instruction across the grade levels and as students move from primarily Spanish to English instruction.

Four theoretical premises undergird the program:

- *Challenge* — consistently challenge students academically;

- *Continuity* — achieve continuity in curriculum and instruction as students move from primary to upper grades and from Spanish to English language arts;

- *Connections* — build upon and make explicit connections between students' knowledge, skills, and experiences and the academic curriculum to be learned; and

- *Comprehensiveness* — address both meaning and skills.

Why Did It Get Started?

The Three-Year Transition Program was developed and evaluated by educators and researchers in the Los Angeles area over a 5-year period (1991–95). The impetus for the project was a growing concern among administrators, teachers, and parents in a particular group of schools about the transitional phase of the bilingual program (when students actually begin English reading and writing). Students seemed to be doing well in Spanish at the lower and middle grades but very poorly in English at the upper grades.

How Does It Work?

Grade three is explicitly considered a Pre-Transition year, grade four is Transition I, and grade five is Transition II. Each phase is described below.

- The thrust of the *Pre-Transition year* is intensive Spanish reading and writing instruction and extensive oral English development. The Pre-Transition goal is to have all students performing at grade level in Spanish reading and writing, and at the speech emergence level in oral English development by the end of third grade.

- During the *Transition I year*, students begin English language arts and continue receiving Spanish language arts. By the end of the year, students should be able to show at least initial reading and writing fluency in English (beginning of third grade level), increase their academic oral English language proficiency, and continue to demonstrate grade-level Spanish reading and writing proficiency.

- The *Transition II year* concentrates intensively on English literacy. By the end of Transition II, students should be decoding and comprehending grade-level material in English, both in language arts and in the content areas. The goal is reclassification: students have transitioned and can perform successfully in a mainstream program when they have grade-level English skills.

As a way of maintaining continuity and capitalizing on students' Spanish literacy skills and experiences, the same language arts model is used across the 3-year program. The model comprises 12 components organized into three groups:

- *Units of Study* — Literature Units (Experience-Text-Relationship), Literature Logs, Instructional Conversation, and Culminating Writing Projects;

- *Skill Building* — Assigned Independent Reading, Reading Comprehension Strategies (strategic reading), Writing Conventions Lessons, Dictation, and English Language Development through Literature (specifically for Pre-Transition); and

- *Other Support Components* — Teacher Read-Alouds, Pleasure Reading, and Interactive Journals.

Model components were selected and refined to establish a high degree of academic challenge and to address comprehensively the full array of literacy skills and competencies (e.g., from spelling to revision, from literal comprehension to literary analysis, and from recitation to high-level discussions).

What Are The Costs?

During the first 3 years of implementation, a full-time facilitator or trainer is required. This position can be established through either Title VII funding, reallocation of Title I funds, or with district resources. Technical assistance and materials for year 1 typically average about $20,000. Continued assistance during years 2 and 3 cost approximately $5,000 per year.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

A system and structure to assist with implementation is under development. The model is phased in over a 3-year period that involves both organizational changes and sustained professional development for grades three through five teachers, and for the Title VII, Title I, and district-provided facilitator. Establishing the 3-year design of the program involves improving assessment and placement procedures, organizing Pre-Transition classes by oral English language proficiency levels, and constituting and staffing Transition I and Transition II classes.

Professional development addresses implementation of the language arts model for each phase of the transition program and involves three stages: classroom organization; literature units; and skill-building components. School-site training and coordination is carried out by program facilitators. Facilitators and a small number of teachers are trained by project staff during an initial 2-week Summer Institute, and 6 full-day follow-up meetings conducted across the first year of implementation. During years 2 and 3, ongoing professional development is carried out by school personnel. The facilitator and two or three lead teachers continue to attend regular support and guidance workshops led by project staff.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Longitudinal evaluations conducted at the five original schools sites where the program is in operation indicate that the Three-Year Transition Program is more effective than the transitional bilingual program students receive. The findings include the following:

- Compared to matched controls, students who were in the program scored significantly higher on both standardized and performance-based measures of Spanish literacy at grade three and English literacy at grade five.

- Sixty-one percent of the Spanish-speaking students who participated in all phases of the program were formally reclassified as fluent-English-proficient by the end of grade five, compared to only 25 percent of matched comparison students.

- At the end of fifth grade, program students were significantly more likely to report more frequent independent reading, more frequent use of the public library, and also more positive attitudes towards their first language.

- Program students were also more likely to report positive attitudes towards reading and writing in Spanish, and frequent reading and writing in Spanish outside of school.

- At the end of grade five, program students also scored significantly higher than control students on standardized measures of mathematics.

Where Can I See It?

Demonstration sites are available in the Los Angeles area for visits.

Whom Do I Contact?

Bill Saunders or Claude Goldenberg
Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence
The California State University, Long Beach
Department of Teacher Education
1250 Bellflower Boulevard
Long Beach, California 90840
Telephone: 310–536–0156 (Saunders) or 562–985–4443 (Goldenberg); Fax: 562–985–1774
E-mail: cgolden@ucla.edu or bsaunder@ucla.edu

The Research Base

The four theoretical premises (Challenge, Continuity, Connections, and Comprehensiveness) are grounded in studies that have tried to identify the characteristics of successful programs for English-language learners. The program is designed around the study of literature because research has found that students benefit from extensive and intensive opportunities to work with text, to study interesting stories. Based upon research conducted as part of the Kamehameha Elementary Education Program in Hawaii and Spanish-speaking Latino communities in southern California, the Experience-Text-Relationship approach was selected as the framework for studying literature. Through discussion, writing activities, and reading, the teacher helps students study the story in relationship to their own experiences. Students learn to comprehend text, to make connections between the text and their own lives, and to develop more fully formed concepts through this recurrent process of individual and social discourse.

Grounded in second language acquisition theory, the literature units help provide substantial comprehensible input—language that includes slightly more sophisticated structures or vocabulary than the learner can produce on his or her own, but language that is understandable within the context in which it is used. The literature unit becomes a meaningful social context in which words, phrases, language structures, and concepts are used, acquired, and learned.

Two-Way Immersion Education

What Is It?

Two-way immersion is an educational model that integrates native English speakers and native speakers of another language for all or most of the day, with the goals of promoting high academic achievement, first- and second-language development, and cross-cultural understanding for all students. In two-way immersion programs, language learning takes place primarily through content instruction. Academic subjects are taught to all students through both English and the non-English language. As students and teachers work together to perform academic tasks, the students' language abilities are developed, along with their knowledge of content area subject matter.

Why Did It Get Started?

The earliest two-way immersion programs began in the 1960s and 1970s, in programs such as Coral Way in Miami and the Inter-American Magnet School in Chicago. However, transitional bilingual education quickly became the predominant model for including native language use in the education of language-minority students, and these programs were typically not integrated with second language instruction for native English speakers. It has only been over the past decade that there has been greater interest in the two-way immersion model. This increasing interest in the two-way immersion model is most likely due to the convergence of bilingual education research, which has indicated that extended native language development has positive educational outcomes for language-minority students, and foreign language immersion research, which has shown that native English speakers benefit from early foreign language instruction through the immersion model.

How Does It Work?

While there is a great deal of variation with regard to program features of two-way immersion programs, there are also some important core similarities:

- ✎ The *student populations are balanced*, with approximately 50 percent native English speakers and 50 percent native speakers of the non-English language.

- ✎ *Academic instruction* takes place through *both languages*, with the non-English language being used from 50 to 90 percent of the time.

In this way, all students have the opportunity to be both first-language models and second-language learners. Furthermore, two-way immersion creates an additive bilingual environment for all students, since the first language is maintained while the second language is acquired.

Other effective program elements are described below.

✎ *Teaching Strategies for Language and Content*

Two-way immersion teachers tend to use cooperative learning, thematic units, hands-on materials, and visual and graphic displays to teach content area material. Most classrooms have language-rich environments, and strategies such as repetition and rephrasing are used to make language comprehensible. In addition to language modeling from the teacher, students are afforded many opportunities to read, write, and speak in both languages in order to facilitate their language development.

✎ *Separation of Languages by Teachers and Students*

Teachers in two-way immersion programs teach for extended periods of time in one designated language, and encourage both native speakers and second-language learners to communicate in the language of instruction to the best of their ability.

✎ *Integration of Students*

Students from both language backgrounds learn together for significant portions of the day. Some programs separate students by language background for language arts instruction in the native and/or second language, while others maintain student integration for the entire day.

✎ *Duration of Program*

Programs provide bilingual instruction for at least 4 to 6 years, and parents are advised that continuous student enrollment for the duration of the program is advisable.

✎ *Family and Community Involvement*

The most successful two-way immersion programs recognize the importance of support from families and the community at large. Serious efforts are made to ensure that both languages and cultures are valued equally, and that all families are included in school decision-making processes.

✎ *Availability of Resources*

Because bilingualism is one of the three main goals of two-way immersion programs, it is important that the school have not only classroom materials in both languages, but also school-wide materials such as library resources and computer software in both languages.

What Are The Costs?

There are no obligatory costs associated with two-way immersion programs. That is, no specific materials are needed, nor is there a required program facilitator. However, the availability of both bilingual pedagogical materials and a bilingual coordinator who is free from teaching responsibilities can greatly enhance the quality of a two-way immersion program. In addition, because many teachers lack teaching experience in two-way immersion classrooms, it is helpful to provide pre-service and in-service training to the teaching staff. Extra costs involved with two-way immersion programs are frequently funded from Federal and state compensatory and bilingual education funds in the school.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

The impetus for developing a two-way immersion program can come from a variety of sources: parents, teachers, administrators, or research partners. Schools that are interested in implementing a two-way immersion model usually begin by collecting information about the model through research centers, such as the Center for Applied Linguistics, as well as through schools that currently have such programs in operation. This information allows the school to make decisions about key features of the program:

- Will it be a magnet school or a neighborhood school?
- Will it be a whole-school program, or a strand within a school?
- What percentage of time will the non-English language be used for instruction?
- In what language will initial literacy instruction be given?

Once these key decisions have been made, most schools invite a professional developer with expertise in two-way immersion programs to train teachers and support staff in effective two-way immersion teaching strategies. Many new programs seek help from established programs, both for pre-service and in-service guidance. These mentoring partnerships help new programs to deal with unanticipated issues that may arise during the first few years of implementation.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Many two-way immersion programs have received Title VII funding, and have therefore been required to conduct annual evaluations of student progress. A review of these findings indicates that while there is a wide range of variation with regard to academic achievement and language proficiency outcomes of students enrolled in two-way immersion programs, many programs have determined that their students perform as well or better than comparable students enrolled in alternative programs within the same district. On a state level, these findings have been

replicated in a study of two-way bilingual programs in California. Other studies, including a national longitudinal study of two-way bilingual programs, have also found that language-minority students enrolled in two-way immersion programs attain higher levels of academic achievement over the long term than students enrolled in other educational programs within the same district.

Where Can I See It?

Two-way immersion programs are currently in operation in 19 states. For information on program location, as well as background and contact information for all programs, contact the Center for Applied Linguistics.

Whom Do I Contact?

The Center for Applied Linguistics
1118 22nd Street NW
Washington DC 20037-1214
Telephone: 202– 429–9292; Fax: 202–659–5641
E-mail: liz@cal.org; chris@cal.org; donna@cal.org

The Research Base

A number of principles from both bilingual education research and foreign language research provide the theoretical rationale for two-way immersion. First, bilingual education research indicates that content knowledge learned through one language paves the way for knowledge acquisition in the second language. When native language instruction is provided with balanced second-language support, students can attain higher levels of academic achievement than if they had been taught in the second language only. Second, researchers in bilingual education assert that a second language is best acquired by language-minority students after their first language is established.

Specifically, language-minority students with strong oral language and literacy skills in the first language tend to achieve greater levels of second-language proficiency than students with limited native-language ability. Third, immersion programs enable language- majority children (those who are native speakers of the high-status language of the society, i.e., English in the United States) to develop second-language proficiency without compromising their academic achievement. Finally, for all students, language is learned best when it is the medium of instruction rather than the exclusive goal of instruction. In immersion settings, students learn language while learning content, because there is a real need to communicate while engaged in content-related tasks.

Urban Learner Framework

What Is It?

The Urban Learner Framework is an integrated knowledge base that incorporates and disseminates the most current, promising, and pertinent research concerned with improving and restructuring schooling in urban districts. This knowledge base has been organized into a decision-making framework challenging the sweeping generalizations that have envisioned the urban learner as deprived, underachieving, unmotivated, and at-risk. It presents a new vision of the urban learner as culturally diverse, capable, effortful, and resilient and represents a major paradigm shift in research and theories of intelligence and learning.

Why Did It Get Started?

Beginning in 1991, staff at Research for Better Schools, a Philadelphia-based research and development laboratory, working with educators in Washington, D.C.; Baltimore; Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, developed the Urban Learner Framework to address the complex issues that must be dealt with in restructuring urban schools. The Framework has been used widely in these mid-Atlantic school systems as well as other school districts across the country.

How Does It Work?

The power and usefulness of the Urban Learner Framework comes from its integration of research knowledge into a coherent focus for developing strategies. Because the Framework's vision is integrated, it helps to reduce the fragmentation produced by reforms that deal solely with organizational processes or with aspects of pedagogy. Internalizing the principles of the Framework enables educational communities to explore new meanings, examine current practices, focus leadership, develop context-specific strategies, and expand accountability. The Urban Learner Framework has two major features:

- An emphasis on four research-based themes that serve as the foundation for the new vision of the urban learner, and

- An emphasis on the implications of the research-based themes for decision-making within community and school organizations.

The four research themes are described below.

✎ *Cultural and Linguistic Diversity and Learning*

All children bring specific cultural knowledge, experiences, and strengths with them to school. The Urban Learner Framework encourages teachers to connect with learners' cultural

experiences and challenge them with relevant instructional materials in order to facilitate learning and cognitive growth. The goal is help each child to develop fully. The emphasis on culture in the Urban Learner Framework highlights the fundamental role that culture plays in all human development.

✎ *Unrecognized Abilities and Underdeveloped Potential*

Each child possesses a different combination of natural talents across the range of intelligences that include logical-mathematical, leadership, interpersonal, organizational, linguistic, bodily-kinesthetic, musical, artistic, and spatial intelligences. The Urban Learner Framework advocates that teachers, administrators, and school settings should attend to this range of intelligences and develop them through authentic, relevant and academically rigorous curricula. Furthermore, a curriculum that includes cooperative learning supports student work by building enthusiasm for the wide range of student intellectual accomplishments.

✎ *Enhancing Ability Development through Motivation and Effort*

Urban learners often are not challenged to move beyond initial errors, and as their potential to learn goes undeveloped, their motivation and effort wane. High academic achievement is supported by a belief that ability increases under positive, supportive conditions, such as teachers having high expectations for all students, believing that effort can increase success, and recognizing that students learn through different experiences. Teachers can use group problem-solving activities and project-focused tasks to provide more opportunities for students to learn by tackling challenging, personally-relevant subject matter and to experience both social and intellectual rewards for their efforts.

✎ *Resilience*

Resilience refers to the energy and strategies that urban learners apply in order to overcome adversity. Students develop resilience in school from encountering caring and supportive teachers and from being challenged by an accelerated curriculum built on high expectations. Under these conditions, students develop protective mechanisms that reduce the impact of risk, reverse the effects of negative labeling, and low expectations, raise students' self-efficacy and self-esteem, and open new opportunities for learning.

The second major feature of the Urban Learner Framework is a set of *decision-making guidelines* to aid educational communities and schools in their efforts to use the Urban Learner Framework knowledge base in moving toward systemic change. Every day, urban educators at all levels make decisions in each of four functional areas of school organization: (1) determining appropriate curriculum, instruction, and assessment; (2) designing effective staff development programs; (3) establishing supportive school environments; and (4) building visionary leadership and effective management. These decisions will benefit from being informed by the Framework's unique vision of the urban learner.

What Are the Costs?

Interested districts may purchase materials that provide an overview of the Framework as well as the video and associated guides which describe the Framework and how it can be used. The costs of these items is very modest.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

The Urban Learner Framework has been introduced in districts and schools through a number of entry points. The superintendent, director of curriculum, director of professional development, or director of research of the school system usually learns about the Framework after attending a presentation, reading a published paper, or through a recommendation from a colleague. A presentation of the Urban Learner Framework is scheduled and a process, mutually agreed upon by the consultant and the district or school representative, is developed. The process includes the following:

- Presentation and discussion of the Framework knowledge base;
- Selection of readings relevant to the context;
- Discussion of action research that identifies contextual data, such as student achievement patterns, existing plans and programs, instructional staff strengths, political climate, and available resources;
- Presentation of examples of what the Urban Learner Framework looks like in practice;
- Development of an action plan;
- Professional development and implementation; and
- Evaluation.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Districts using the Urban Learner Framework have seen the development of more positive attitudes among practitioners regarding the learning potential of all children, and more awareness of their role and responsibility in ensuring that all children succeed. The Urban Learner Framework also serves as a bridge between research and educational practice in some districts, providing staff with a mechanism for helping teachers and administrators reflect on how the research ideas on which the Framework is based, can be used to inform their practice. In other districts, the Urban Learner Framework has been introduced as a management guide or as a tool

for the design of professional development and instruction. The Framework has consistently received strong positive evaluations, from audiences of educators, from parents, from districts and schools when used as a guide for designing and implementing systemic change.

Where Can I See It?

The Urban Learner Framework is being introduced in several school districts, including St. Paul, Minnesota; Battle Creek, Michigan; Kansas City, Missouri; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Whom Do I Contact?

Belinda Williams
Northeast And Islands Regional Educational Laboratory At Brown University
222 Richmond Street, Suite 300
Providence, Rhode Island 02903-4226
Telephone: 800–521–9550 ext. 236; or 401–274–9548 ext. 236
Fax: 401–421–7650
E-mail: Belinda Williams@brown.edu

The Research Base

Recent theories of intelligence, learning, and instruction suggest four themes that, taken together, generate a vision of urban learners as culturally diverse, capable, motivated, and resilient. The Urban Learner Framework draws on the findings from a variety of research areas:

- *Cultural and Linguistic Diversity and Learning* — emerging evidence from brain research, and studies from anthropology, psychology and sociology highlight the fundamental role that culture plays in all human development.

- *Unrecognized Abilities and Underdeveloped Potential* — cognitive research suggests that intelligence is modifiable, and that each child possesses a unique combination of natural talents across the range of many different intelligences.

- *Enhancing Ability Development through Motivation and Effort* — recent research on other cultures indicates that academic achievement is more likely when students believe that effort will lead to success.

- *Resilience* — research suggests that urban learners are more likely to eschew the dangers of the inner city, such as gangs, drugs and violence when they are provided with caring, challenging, and meaningful educational experiences.

Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

What Is It?

For the past 5 years, the Center for School Improvement has collaborated with a number of Chicago elementary schools on an initiative called Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change. Each school in the collaborative serves an impoverished community where student achievement is very low. The network includes two "continuing" schools that have been collaborating with the Center for several years, and five "new" schools (including two "probation" schools) that joined the network 2 years ago. The clustering enables schools to be a resource to each other. Additionally, to break down schools' isolation from outside expertise, the program also partners with the Martha L. King Early Language and Literacy Center at the Ohio State University. This is the National Center for Reading Recovery.

Why Did It Get Started?

The Center for School Improvement was initiated simultaneously with the enactment of Public Act 85–1418. This legislation sought to enhance children's learning opportunities in the Chicago Public Schools, and reconnect local schools with their communities. Toward these ends, principals were placed on performance contracts, each school elected a parent-dominated local school council, teachers' voices were amplified by virtue of their seats on the local school council and also by the creation of a professional personnel advisory committee, and local schools were given much more fiscal authority. As a university- based, external partner, the Center for School Improvement's mission is to promote each school's comprehensive development.

How Does It Work?

At present, all of the schools have made significant progress toward restructuring. They are deeply engaged in a comprehensive school development process that aims to:

- Enhance the *leadership capacity* of staff and parents;
- Strengthen *school committees* (the local school council, the professional personnel advisory committee and other committees) such that schools become responsive to the needs of their communities and self-guided;
- Develop professional expertise and practice such that a *professional community* develops, teaching and learning is enhanced, and all students have the opportunity to attain the highest academic standards; and

- Build *local capacity* so that evaluation and accountability is rigorous, and decision-making is democratic, data-driven, strategic, and focused on the needs of children.

The Literacy as a Lever for Change initiative is organized around four programmatic areas: leadership development, literacy, social services, and building local capacity for strategic planning and evaluation. We summarize our strategies and core activities below.

✎ *Literacy Initiative*

At the primary level, the Center for School Improvement's literacy initiative is a collaboration with Ohio State University. At the intermediate and upper grades, we collaborate with the Chicago Area Writing Project and Writers in Schools. These partnerships enable schools to draw on the principles of literacy instruction and teacher professional development that have been evolved in these programs over more than two decades.

The program aims to ensure the equity goal of success for *all* students by creating differentiated services that include intensive tutorials, small group instruction, and enriched literacy classrooms. Teachers are connected with outside expertise and each other through a year-long workshop. Follow-up support is provided from Ohio State University, the Center for School Improvement, and the school's literacy coordinators. A local assessment system is also developed by teachers to ensure that assessment is authentic and always connected to meaningful instruction. Family literacy programs round out the initiative. Through a home-book program and other parent education activities, the program seeks to meaningfully engage all parents as full partners in their children's education.

✎ *Social Service Initiative*

The Center for School Improvement's social service initiative coordinates and develops services for children, and better connects each school to its community. Most importantly, it engages all of the adults in the school community in sustained discussion about the kinds of citizens they would like their children to become, the joint responsibility that parents and professionals must take for children's well-being, and the norms of discipline and behavior that must be established to recreate schools as caring, personal environments that best promote children's development. Specific activities include the development of a social service team at each school. These teams meet and deliberate on a regular basis, visit community agencies, and problem solve across communities. The aim is for school decision-making to become deliberative, strategic, and fully inclusive.

The social service aspect of the model is viewed as prerequisite to any meaningful academic change. It ameliorates parents' and professionals' isolation from each other, creates time and a safe environment for adults in the school community to discuss children's needs, and establishes a social service team whose job it is to coordinate and personalize services around those needs.

✎ *Leadership Development*

The aim of the Center for School Improvement's leadership activities is to develop the capacity of the entire professional staff to work together and with parents. This is the only viable path toward creating school communities that can become self-guided and act in the best interests of children.

Center for School Improvement senior staff mentor principals on a continuous basis. The program encourages the formation of a leadership team at each school. Staff from the Center regularly meet with this team to jointly evaluate school plans, budgets, programs, staffing, and ties to external expertise. The aim is to develop a team that broadly represents the school community and can share responsibility with the principal and local school council for budget and school improvement planning.

Network schools are also asked to fund a role for at least two full-time, freed literacy coordinators. These individuals receive intensive training and mentoring from Ohio State University and Center for School Improvement staff. The job of these teacher leaders is to teach a small group of students, and individually mentor the efforts of classroom teachers as they implement the literacy framework.

✎ *Building Analytic Capacities*

The aim of these activities is that schools develop the capacity to collect good information, then analyze and use it for programming, planning, evaluation, and budgeting. Schools are encouraged to engage in self-analysis, and together with Center staff, surveys, needs assessments, interviews, and classroom visits are conducted. Feedback is provided to the schools by Center staff. Students' test scores are analyzed and findings are shared with school staff. Implications for staff development and strategic planning (school improvement planning, budgeting, and personnel selection) are also pursued.

Additional documentation and evaluation activities include annual testing of a sample of students engaged in the initiative and the development of a local assessment system for instructional guidance. These assessments provide the public evaluations that can document both progress and problems. Most importantly, substantive feedback to schools opens up discussion about what the tests are measuring, as well as the resources that teachers need in order to promote the kinds of quality instruction that will enhance student learning and performance.

What Are The Costs?

Network schools are asked to enter a cost-sharing arrangement with the Center for School Improvement. The bulk of this sum pays for the two literacy coordinator positions. Support for Center for School Improvement staff, research, and program development comes from the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk, the Chicago Community Trust, the

MacArthur and Joyce Foundations, the Annenberg Challenge Grant, and also contributions from two private philanthropists.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Network schools must be amenable to a multi-year collaboration and be willing to allocate the necessary funding to support this comprehensive initiative.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

The Literacy as a Lever for Change initiative is in a pilot stage. To date, implementation of the program is showing classroom effects, that is, teachers who are actively implementing the literacy framework are showing statistical and educational improvements in student learning as measured on standardized tests and local assessments. In addition, there have been positive changes in school culture and climate, a pluralization of leadership, and enhanced parent involvement in both governance activities and support for children's learning.

Where Can I See It?

A limited number of site visits can be arranged by contacting the Director of Research of the Center for School Improvement.

Whom Do I Contact?

Sharon Rollow, Director of Research
Center for School Improvement
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Telephone: 773–702–4472; Fax: 773–702–2010
E-mail: rollow@consortium-chicago.org

The Research Base

The Center for School Improvement's literacy initiative is grounded in more than 20 years of research on children's learning and teachers' professional development at the National Center for Reading Recovery at the Martha L. King Early Language and Literacy Center at the Ohio State University. The leadership initiative is based on theories of democratic governance. The literature on organizational development grounds the Center for School Improvement's work with schools around strategic planning and building analytic capacity.

Classroom and Curriculum Redesign Models

Adaptive Learning Environments Model

What Is It?

The Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM) is an innovative educational program designed to meet the diverse social and academic needs of students in regular classes. A product of over 2 decades of research, development and school-based implementation in a variety of communities, the model serves as an alternative approach to educational reform for schools striving to be responsive to the learning needs of individual students with varying abilities, experiences, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Underlying the model's design is the premise that students learn in different ways and at varying rates and require different amounts of instructional support. The Adaptive Learning Environments Model accommodates and builds upon these differences through adaptive instruction, in which a variety of instructional methods are adopted and tailored to the needs and the learning characteristics of individual students, and specific interventions are used to increase each student's ability to benefit from the learning environment.

Why Did It Get Started?

The call for programs that work for the educational success of each student, including those with special needs and those who are considered to be academically at risk, has become a central issue in school reform programs. There have been significant advances in theory and practical knowledge of effective instruction, and growing evidence suggests a great variability in the ways that students acquire, organize, retain, and generate knowledge and skills. The Adaptive Learning Environments Model was designed to cull from the knowledge base on what makes teaching and learning more effective and efficient.

How Does It Work?

The Adaptive Learning Environments Model's goal is to ensure achievement of basic academic skills and other valued educational outcomes, including students' positive self-perceptions of academic and social competence, sense of responsibility for their own education and the broader community and competencies for coping with the social and academic demands of schooling. In order to accomplish this, the model focuses on systematically integrating features that theory, research, and practice have shown to be instructionally effective and pedagogically meaningful.

Accordingly, implementation of the Adaptive Learning Environments Model is supported by three categories of program design dimensions: delivery of adaptive instruction in regular classroom settings; classroom management and program implementation; and school- and district-level interventions.

Effective implementation of the model requires teachers to use all forms of knowledge in implementing demonstrably effective classroom practices to accommodate students' diverse learning needs. Although adaptive instruction calls for individualized planning, teachers do not work with students on a one-on-one basis. Whole-class and small-group instruction and peer-based cooperative learning are incorporated when deemed particularly suited for achieving certain intended student outcomes or ways to improve instructional efficiency.

In the Adaptive Learning Environments classroom, individual differences are viewed as the norm rather than the exception. While differences in rates of progress are recognized by teachers, parents, and the students themselves, the acquisition of basic academic skills and the development of social competence and self-esteem are expected of each student. Under the Adaptive Learning Environments Model program, specialist teachers (e.g., reading specialists funded under the Title I program or special education teachers) and other related services professionals (e.g., speech pathologists or school psychologists) work with regular classroom teachers in a coordinated system of instructional and related service delivery.

What Are The Costs?

Implementation of the Adaptive Learning Environments Model does not require the purchase of specially designed curricula. In almost all cases, a school's current curricular resources can be modified and adapted for use in Adaptive Learning Environments classes. However, a careful analysis of a given school district's budget constraints is the first step in the needs assessment phase of designing an implementation plan. Cost figures vary with district budgets.

Districts interested in adopting the Adaptive Learning Environments Model as a core general education program need to allocate funds to cover the normal start-up costs of implementing an innovative program. Start-up costs tend to vary from district to district, depending on the nature of the district's curricular preparedness, training requirements, and ability to redeploy current resources.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

The Adaptive Learning Environments Model is designed to provide instruction that is responsive to student needs and to provide school staff with ongoing professional development and school-based program implementation support to achieve student success. Implementation features the following design elements.

- *Individualized Progress Plans* consist of two components. The first is a highly structured prescriptive component for basic skills mastery. In addition, an exploratory component provides learning opportunities that foster student self-direction and problem-solving ability while fostering social and personal development to enhance student learning success.

- A *Diagnostic-Prescriptive Monitoring System* incorporates a standards-based curriculum and assessment system to ensure student mastery of subject-matter knowledge and learning skills.

- A *Classroom Instruction-Management System* provides implementation support that focuses on student self-responsibility and teacher teaming in implementing a coordinated approach to instructional and related service delivery.

- A *Data-Based Professional Development Program* provides ongoing training and technical assistance support that is targeted to meet the implementation support needs of the individual staff.

- A *School-Based Restructuring Process* provides school and classroom organizational support and redeployment of school resources and staff expertise to achieve and sustain a high degree of program implementation.

- An active *Family Involvement Program* is targeted to support student learning success.

When a high degree of implementation is achieved, a unique classroom scenario is created. Students can be found working in virtually every area of the classroom, engaging in a variety of learning activities, including participating in small-group instruction, receiving one-to-one tutoring, or engaging in peer-based collaborative activities. Teachers circulate among the students, instructing and providing corrective feedback.

Instruction is based on diagnostic test results and informal assessments by the teacher. Every student is expected to make steady progress in meeting the curricular standards. Learning tasks are broken down into incremental steps, providing frequent opportunities for evaluation.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

In schools where the Adaptive Learning Environments Model components have been adopted, data are collected on degree of implementation, classroom processes, and student outcomes, such as student achievement and student attitudes about their schools and learning experience. Findings from over two decades of implementation of the model in a variety of school settings provide consistent evidence that effective implementation leads to positive changes in classroom process. These changes result in intended academic, attitudinal, and social competence outcomes.

In classrooms where a high degree of implementation is achieved, teachers tend to spend more time on instruction than on managing students and students tend to be highly task oriented. Steady and productive interaction between teachers and students, and among students, replaces the passive learning mode typically found in conventional classrooms. Interactions among students, for the most part, focus on sharing ideas and working together on learning tasks.

Distracted behavior on the part of individual students is minimal and does not seem to interfere with the work of others.

Standardized achievement test scores in reading and math indicate that implementation of the model consistently leads to student achievement that meets or exceeds expected gains. Achievement results from various sites over the years have compared favorably with comparison sites in terms of national test norms, as well as district and population norms. Significant differences have been found with special education students who are integrated in regular Adaptive Learning Environments classes.

Where Can I See It?

The Laboratory for Student Success can provide a list of demonstration sites available for visitation.

Whom Do I Contact?

Dr. Margaret C. Wang, Professor and Director
Laboratory for Student Success at
Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education
1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122–6091
Telephone: 215–204–3000 or 800–892–5550; Fax: 215–204–5130
E-mail: lss@vm.temple.edu; Website http://www.temple.edu/LSS

The Research Base

Adaptive education approaches to improve student learning outcomes has been noted by researchers and practitioners as a promising alternative approach for accommodating the diverse learning needs of individual students, including those with exceptional talents and those with special needs. Implementing adaptive education strategies as an alternative approach to improving student outcomes can be traced back to the early 1900's as a part of the progressive education movement in this country. Changes in the conceptualization of individual differences and the growing research base in developmental and cognitive psychology have resulted in increasing attention to individual differences in how learning takes place and what influences learning. Individual differences in learning are no longer considered static, but capable of modification either before the instructional process begins or as a part of the process.

Curriculum Compacting

What Is It?

High-ability or high-achieving students are frequently asked to participate in practice exercises or instruction that they have previously mastered. Classroom teachers should provide curriculum that is adapted to the learning needs, rates, and interests of our above-average students, but often do not have the needed planning time or guidelines. Curriculum compacting is a process to "streamline" and modify the grade-level curriculum by eliminating material that students have previously learned. In doing so, all learners are challenged, and students who demonstrate high levels of achievement are provided with time for differentiated enrichment or acceleration activities.

Why Did It Get Started?

An absence of challenge in the regular curriculum exists for high-ability or high-achieving students. Students who already know the material can face boredom, inattentiveness, and underachievement, and may become discipline problems in their classrooms. The need for curriculum compacting for some students is due to inadequate textbooks, repetition in content, and mismatch between student ability and instruction. For some students, less is more, particularly with curriculum compacting. Less repetition of previously mastered material can result in more learning for some students. Modifying curriculum is not a new concept; many educators have been effectively practicing it for years. Curriculum compacting is one way of modifying and differentiating content that has been widely used across the country.

How Does It Work?

In the curriculum compacting process, a form entitled the *Curriculum Compactor* can be used by teachers to guide the compacting services provided to the students. Teachers pre-assess students to gain information about their level of knowledge related to the subject. The following eight steps are involved:

- ✎ Identification of the relevant learning objectives in a particular subject area or grade level:
- ✎ Identification of students who may possess mastery of these objectives;
- ✎ Development of some means to pretest students on one or more of the objectives prior to instruction;
- ✎ Pretesting students;

- Streamlining practice, drill, or instructional time for students who have demonstrated mastery of the objectives;

- Individualization of instructional options for students who have not yet mastered all of the specified objectives, but who are capable of mastering the objectives more quickly than other classmates;

- Development of enrichment or acceleration options for students who have demonstrated mastery of the learning objectives; and

- Development and maintenance of records of this process and the instructional options available to students whose work has been compacted.

What Are The Costs?

The costs are relatively low: teacher training and professional development in the process of compacting, and providing differentiated replacement activities. Professional development can be provided in a summer training program or directly on site by consultants or staff members who have learned the process and can serve as peer coaches. Costs for training and replacement materials range from $3,000 to $8,000, depending on the size of the school.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

A committee of teachers and/or parents and/or administrators decides to implement compacting. All teachers receive a detailed teacher's manual supplemented by inservice at the beginning of the school year that is provided by trainers. A technical report and a videotape training program are available for classroom teachers, with an implementation guidebook.

The staff development model emphasizes initial training with extensive classroom follow-up, coaching, and group discussion. Throughout the year, follow-up visits are made to the school staff, and inservice presentations are conducted on such topics as management of compacting, instructional pace, and enrichment teaching and learning. The building facilitator also organizes many informal sessions to facilitate discussions about differentiation and enrichment teaching and learning.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Several studies have documented the effectiveness of curriculum compacting. One study examined the effects of curriculum compacting with elementary student populations including economically disadvantaged and limited-English proficient students. After receiving staff development services, teachers in three treatment groups implemented curriculum compacting for one or two high-ability students in their classrooms. The control group teachers identified

one or two high-ability students and continued normal teaching practices without implementing curriculum compacting. A battery of pre- and post-achievement tests, Content Area Preference Scales, and a questionnaire regarding attitude toward learning were administered to identified students in the fall and at the completion of the school year. The results of this study indicate that the compacting process can be implemented in a wide variety of settings, with positive effects for both students and teachers.

Where Can I See It?

Classroom teachers in schools across the country use curriculum compacting. Contact The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented for the nearest sites.

Whom Do I Contact?

The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented
University of Connecticut
362 Fairfield Road, U–7
Storrs, Connecticut 06269–2007
Telephone: 860–486–4676; Fax: 860–486–2900
E-mail: epsadm06@uconnvm.uconn.edu; Website: http://www.gifted.uconn.edu

The Research Base

The Curriculum Compacting Model is influenced by the body of research that indicates that instruction must take into account the varying abilities, background interests and learning styles of the various students. Research also suggests that to engage students' interests and effort, they must be provided with stimulating and increasingly challenging material. Curriculum Compacting provides a mechanism for differentiating curriculum within the classroom to respond to the varying learning styles and abilities of the students. It also encourages flexible grouping for instructional purposes within classrooms, to enable challenges to be provided for high-ability students.

Enrichment Clusters

What Are They?

Enrichment clusters are groups of students who share common interests, and who come together during specially designed time blocks to pursue these interests. The main rationale for participation in one or more clusters is that *students and teachers want to be there*. All teachers and teacher aides are involved in organizing the clusters, and numerous schools have also involved parents and other community members. Adult involvement in any particular cluster should be based on the same type of interest assessment that is used for students in selecting clusters of choice.

Everything that students do in the cluster is directed toward completing a product or delivering a service for a real-world audience. For example, a cluster might exist based on flight, as in the following cluster title and description:

> **Flight School: Designing and Building Your Own Aircraft**
> Basic principles of aerodynamics will be studied to learn what keeps airplanes in the air. You will design, build, and test fly your own model plane. There will be a contest to see whose plane flies the highest, farthest, and longest.

Why Did It Get Started?

The concept of enrichment learning and teaching evolved from the Enrichment Triad Model. In this model, there are three types of enrichment activities and there is an interaction among them:

- General exploratory activities designed to expose students to a variety of topics and areas of study not ordinarily covered in the regular curriculum;
- Group training in thinking and feeling processes, learning how-to-learn skills, research and reference skills, written skills, oral skills, and visual communication skills; and
- Firsthand investigations of real problems.

The Enrichment model is based on ways in which people learn in a natural environment. Creating a special "place" in the schedule—enrichment clusters—is the best way to guarantee that *every* student will have an opportunity to participate in enrichment experiences.

How Does It Work?

Clusters are offered for an extended time block, usually from one and one-half hours to one-half day per week. Students enter a cluster based on interests and other information gleaned from a *Total Talent Portfolio*. Some students who develop high levels of expertise in a particular area are sometimes asked to serve as an assistant or a facilitator of their own cluster (this is usually provided for younger students).

Enrichment clusters revolve around major disciplines, interdisciplinary themes, or cross-disciplinary topics. A theatrical/television production group, for example, might include actors, writers, technical specialists, and costume designers. Student work is directed toward producing a product or service and the clusters deal with how-to knowledge, thinking skills, and interpersonal relations that apply in the real world. Instead of lesson plans or unit plans, three key questions guide learning:

- What do people with an interest in this area do?
- What knowledge, materials, and other resources are needed for authentic activities in this area?
- In what ways can the product or service be used to affect the intended audience?

What Are The Costs?

Costs are dictated by requisite materials of each cluster. Personnel costs are minimal, but after-school scheduling of clusters may affect this cost. Program costs have ranged from 50¢ to $5.00 per child per cluster session.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Six steps should be considered when implementing enrichment clusters.

- *Assess the Interests of Students and Staff*

Interests can be assessed formally or informally.

- *Create a Schedule*

It is crucial that a specific time within the school day be identified for cluster activities. To be successful and valued, clusters should have a "place" within the school week, and not compete for time with pullout programs, specials, or teacher planning time

✎ *Locate People and Staff to Facilitate Clusters*

Cluster facilitators come from a wide variety of sources. Teachers and staff are the most obvious choices, and they should be asked to think of any friends or family members whom they could recommend. Parents and community people like business owners, retirees, service club members, and faculty and staff at colleges and universities also are excellent resources.

✎ *Provide an Orientation for Cluster Facilitators*

Orienting the facilitators is crucial so that the clusters do not become mini-courses or traditional teacher-directed experiences. A meeting of cluster facilitators should be arranged to discuss the goals, philosophy, and focus of the program.

✎ *Prepare Cluster Descriptions and Register Students*

Provide each student with a description of all the clusters so that he/she may make a choice based on interest areas. Be sure that the facilitators have clearly marked the age range and maximum number of participants.

✎ *Celebrate Your Success*

Recognizing student and facilitator efforts provides strong public relations for the school and brings attention to student products and services developed in the clusters. Products can be exhibited in display cases at the school and/or at a fair for school, family, and community members. Inviting the press in on cluster days will help generate community excitement and involvement.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Research on Enrichment Clusters conducted in ethnically diverse, low-socioeconomic, urban schools indicate that gifted education pedagogy could be successfully used to challenge all students in these schools. Parents were extremely supportive about clusters, as were teachers and students. Attendance in school was better on days in which clusters were held, and enrichment cluster facilitators had more positive views of students' abilities than did classroom teachers. Students developed stronger interests as a result of participation in clusters, and no differences were found in the quality of products completed by students of different levels of achievement. Teachers who used advanced content and advanced methods in their clusters often began to use these strategies in their own classrooms.

Where Can I See It?

Contact The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.

Whom Do I Contact?

The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented
362 Fairfield Road, U–7
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut 06269–2007
Telephone: 860–486–4676; Fax: 860–486–2900
E-mail: epsadm06@uconnvm.uconn.edu; Web site: http://www.gifted.uconn.edu

The Research Base

Several bodies of research have influenced the development of the Enrichment Clusters Model. First, the model is designed based on the research suggesting that instruction must take into account the varying abilities, background interests experiences and learning styles of each student. The Model enables each student to showcase his or her talents in a variety of ways. Secondly, research has found that learning is more meaningful when content and process are learned within the context of a real problem, when students use authentic methods to address the problem and when there is a tangible outcome. Finally, the model builds on research suggesting that all students, including low income students need to be provided with challenging and accelerated learning content. In Enrichment Clusters students work together and with teachers and others, on activities in which they have a strong interest, drawing on those skills and talents which can contribute to the success of the product or outcome.

Families and Schools Together

What Is It?

Families and Schools Together (FAST) is a 2-year, school-based, elementary level program which:

- Builds bonds, trust and supportive networks for families and children;
- Increases parent involvement with children both at school and at home; and
- Increases resiliency, attention span, and readiness to learn in elementary school children.

FAST uses an highly structured activity-based approach to promote the development of school-parent-community-child partnerships. The FAST curriculum is designed to enhance parent-child interactions, empower parents and build parent support groups.

Why Did It Get Started?

The FAST program was developed to address many of the problems faced by elementary schools with significant numbers of students with low achievement. The program was designed around emerging research indicating that partnerships between schools, communities and parents could prevent the school-related performance and behavioral problems of poor children.

Developed in 1988, the FAST program began in the Madison, Wisconsin School District with support from Family Service America, a national organization whose membership includes a large number of community-based counseling and family support agencies. At this time FAST has been implemented in over 250 sites in 26 states. The program can be found in a variety of culturally diverse school communities, and is working in urban inner city as well as isolated, rural schools sites.

How Does It Work?

To join the FAST program, a school must identify and partner with two community-based partner agencies, such as a mental health agency and a substance abuse agency, who agree to work with the school over a period of 2 years. Once the school identifies the partner agencies:

- A FAST team of three professionals, one from the school and one from each of the partner agencies, is identified and trained. Training is provided through the Family Services America National Replication Center, which was established to assist communities offer effective FAST programs.

- Participating children and parents gather once a week for eight sessions, at the school. The eight sessions usually take place around the dinner meal.

- Following graduation from a FAST cycle, families participate in FASTWORKS, a series of monthly family support meetings designed to maintain the active social network formed between the participating families.

Up to 20 children and their parents can be served during each 8-week FAST cycle and a school can sponsor up to four cycles per school year. Parents who have participated in past FAST cycles often play important roles in facilitating and coaching subsequent FAST cycles at their children's school.

What Are The Costs?

The cost for the initial training for the school and its FAST team is $3,900. The costs of supplies per cycle is $1,500. Additional costs include personnel costs for the community partners at $1,500 each per cycle, and for each of participating parent-partner at $800 each. The school-based member of the FAST team may also require compensation unless this is considered a part of that person's regular workday. There are also child care costs involved. Schools usually fund the program with funds from Title I or other Federal or local sources that target schools with significant populations of poor and low performing students.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

The school administrator, perhaps together with the local site based management team, makes a decision to bring the Fast program to their school.

- A decision is made regarding which children to invite as members of the first FAST cycle. There are many ways the *screening process* can be structured, but frequently teachers identify children with problem behaviors who are at risk for serious academic and social problems.

- Once the children have been identified, parents are informed of the concern with the child's behavior. The *parents are then invited* to participate in FAST through a friendly home visit by trained, sensitive, recruiters—FAST parent graduates, in most cases. To promote attendance, FAST offers the intangible incentives of respect and social supports as well as tangible ones such as transportation, a hot meal, and child care for toddlers and infants. Each family also wins a gift package of needed items sometime during the 8-week session.

- *Families gather* with the other 8 to 12 participating families for 8 sessions at the child's school. Meetings follow a structured, uniform agenda that includes carefully planned

opening and closing routines, structured family activities, parent mutual support time, and parent-child play therapy. These are led by a trained team that includes the parent; the school professional, usually a school social worker; a mental health agency representative, usually a clinical social worker; and the substance abuse agency representative, often a substance abuse counselor.

- The *activities* at each session are lively and fun and *build a sense of family unity*. They include eating a meal together, creating a family flag, singing, and lively exercises in communication and feelings identification. The parent-child play therapy, called "Special Play" is at the core of the FAST program. In 15 minutes of uninterrupted quality time, parents play one-on-one with the child in ways that build the child's self-esteem and enhance family communication. The parents are instructed to focus on child-initiated play without directing or criticizing. Parents are encouraged to continue "Special Play" between FAST sessions and over the next 2 years.

- The multi-family sessions also include time for the children to play together while parents visit about common interests and concerns. During this time *parents build an information support network* for themselves to help each other discover solutions to parenting and family concerns.

- At the end of each 8-week FAST cycle, a *graduation* is held in which the contributions and participation of all participants is celebrated. Invitations are sent and certificates are presented by the school principal. Families pride themselves on being "FAST graduates".

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Evaluations of FAST at large numbers of schools where it has been implemented, indicate highly positive outcomes for the children who participate in the program. Research has shown that the behavior both at school and at home of participating children improves. Moreover, there is evidence that these positive changes hold 2 years later. Participating schools report that parents who have participated in the program are much more active in school events than they were previously. The program has received a number of national awards, and currently receives implementation funding support from a number of foundations, such as DeWitt Wallace Readers' Digest Fund, Metropolitan Life, and C. S. Mott.

The FAST program is currently operating in extremely isolated rural areas of northern California, northern Wisconsin and Iowa, as well as inner city neighborhoods in Chicago, New Orleans, Los Angeles, and Washington, DC. FAST has also been implemented in school communities with families whose first language is other than English. There are FAST programs serving 100 percent Vietnamese families, Native American families, Hispanic families and African-American families.

F
A
S
T

Where Can I See It?

For information on how to visit one or more FAST sites contact the developer. There are also a number of videos which portray programs that have been implemented in both rural and inner city school sites.

Whom Do I Contact?

Dr. Lynn McDonald, FAST Program Developer
The FAST Project
Wisconsin Center for Educational Research
University of Wisconsin-Madison
1025 West Johnson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Telephone: 608–263–9476; Fax: 608–263–6448
E-mail: mrmcdona@facstaff.wisc.edu

The Research Base

The FAST program draws on research from a number of behavioral science disciplines including social work, family therapy, child psychiatry, and child and family psychology. The program also blends in knowledge emerging from research in such other fields as delinquency and substance abuse prevention, domestic and other forms of violence prevention, parent involvement in education and family support. FAST makes use of many ideas, clinical practices and research that have been used successfully for years by social work practitioners.

Linking Home and School:
A BRIDGE to the Many Faces of Mathematics

What Is It?

The BRIDGE model is designed to address the following issues: the effects of mathematical study groups on teachers' professional development and pedagogical practices; the mathematical potential of students' households and activities outside of school; taking familial knowledge to an abstract level with potential academic use; and the role of parents in changing teacher practices.

Why Did It Get Started?

For the past 10 years, the Community Literacy Project and the Funds of Knowledge for Teaching Project carried out work based on the idea that household and community knowledge can provide strategic resources for classroom practice. This approach analyzes the sociocultural history of the households of language-minority children, as well as their labor history, which often reveals accumulated bodies of knowledge and an array of skills, information, and strategies. In a Southwestern context, for example, households of rural origin may know about farming and animal management, whereas those with urban roots may know about construction and other matters such as trade, business, and finance on both sides of the border.

How Does It Work?

BRIDGE focuses on developing communities of learners interested in furthering the teaching and learning of mathematics. Three key components center around mathematics:

- Household ethnographic analysis,
- Teacher/researcher study groups, and
- Classroom implementation.

A fourth component, *parents as learning resources*, directly involves parents in the mathematics-learning process.

What Are The Costs?

BRIDGE is supported by a local school district and university cost-sharing.

How Is the Model Implemented in a School?

Following an intensive ethnographic training, which is further supported by readings, teacher-researchers conduct fieldwork in the households of their students. A specific focus is on the mathematical potential of everyday activities such as construction, sewing, budgeting, and gardening. In addition to making household visits, teachers elicit information from their students on the kinds of outside-school practices in their everyday life (e.g., bartering, household chores, construction, mechanics, and infant care). Teachers look specifically for mathematics-related activities and instances of mathematizing.

University-based researchers and teacher-researchers meet regularly in joint study groups to discuss findings and develop an understanding of children's experiences in mathematics. The goal is to develop mathematics learning modules that build on these experiences. These activity settings also serve as a laboratory for developing communities of learners. They focus on teachers as learners of mathematics themselves, engaged in mathematical activities and discussion, and on teachers as agents for pedagogical innovation, engaged in the philosophical underpinnings of such innovation.

Another key aspect of BRIDGE is the connection to students' homes through the active involvement of parents and other household members in the learning process. Parents provide not only household and community knowledge, but information about their children's hobbies and activities that can be used to create learning modules. Parents participate in the creation of learning modules based on their personal expertise and in mathematical activities different from what they have seen in conventional schools.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

The work in the classroom develops communities of learners that reflect a two-way dialogue in mathematics, between school and household. These communities are envisioned to have the following features:

- Parents, students, and teachers participate in joint sociocultural activity;
- Mathematics is something to be discussed and developed;
- Students are engaged in academically challenging activities in mathematics;
- Students are encouraged to use and demonstrate their "informal" knowledge of mathematics; and
- Everyday household activity settings become academic contexts of mathematical learning.

By doing and talking about mathematics in periodic workshops, BRIDGE shares its vision of a mathematics learning community with teachers, parents, and children. Initially, these workshops rely on external materials, eventually moving toward a format where parents bring in mathematical activities based on their experiences. The workshops provide an arena for the discussion of mathematics teaching and learning (and of schooling in general) where all participants share their ideas.

Where Can I See It?

BRIDGE is in progress in various elementary and middle school classrooms in Tucson, Arizona.

Whom Do I Contact?

Marta Civil, Rosi Andrade, or Norma Gonzalez
University of Arizona
Linking Home and School: BRIDGE project
Department of Mathematics
617 North Santa Rita
Tucson, Arizona 85721
Telephone: 520–621–6282; Fax: 520–621–9608
E-mail: andrade@math.arizona.edu, civil@math.arizona.edu, or neg@U.arizona.edu

The Research Base

Mathematics has been viewed by some as a gatekeeping mechanism serving to disenfranchise language-minority children (especially Latino and African-American). Additionally, with respect to achievement, non-Asian minority students begin to lag behind as early as age nine, with the gap increasing further as students get older. Several factors have been identified as contributing to the disparities in educational attainment of language and other minority children, among them, "poor self-concept as a 'doer' of math or science; their negative perception of the utility of these subjects in 'real life'; the stereotyping of math and science as White male activities; and the influence of significant others, such as parents, teachers, and peers, in discouraging participation in these subjects".

The BRIDGE project features collaborative work between teachers and researchers, and places the emphasis on the sociocultural context for mathematics learning. The theory that thematic integration of the curriculum enables students to encounter mathematical concepts within socioculturally relevant problem-solving contexts that are more meaningful than the traditional basal-text oriented approach serves as a partial basis for the model. In addition, BRIDGE includes teacher investigation of the local knowledge of the community, as well as the involvement of parents as learning resources of mathematics.

Talent Development Middle School Mathematics Program

What Is It?

The Talent Development Middle School Mathematics program is based on the idea that all students can learn challenging mathematical ideas. To this end, the program couples a demanding standards and research-based curriculum provided to all students in heterogeneous classrooms with a "double dose" computer-based mathematics curriculum made available to those students who need extra help to succeed in mathematics. The core mathematics curriculum, designed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project, is a demanding mathematics curriculum intended to deepen and broaden students mathematical understanding and their ability to use mathematics. The curriculum develops advanced skills in geometry, data, and algebra. It is particularly well suited to achieving the goal of Algebra for all students in eighth grade.

Because of the challenging nature of the Talent Development Middle School Mathematics curriculum, many students need extra help in order to succeed. Students needing extra help receive an accelerated learning class in addition to their regular 1 hour math class. The "double dose" class replaces an elective course or gym for at least one quarter of each year.

How Did It Get Started?

The Talent Development Middle School Mathematics Program was initially implemented beginning in September 1995 at a Philadelphia middle school serving significant numbers of adolescents placed at risk, as part of the design for a Talent Development Middle School whole school reform. The math program was designed to be consistent with the Talent Development philosophy that all students can learn challenging material if the right types of supportive conditions are fostered.

How Does It Work?

The Talent Development Middle School Mathematics core curriculum, the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project, incorporates both the best practices from around the world and recent understandings of how students learn mathematics in a teacher friendly package. It is a balanced curriculum which blends the acquisition of essential and core mathematical knowledge with frequent and engaging real world applications and uses of mathematics. These applications make mathematics interesting and exciting to both students and teachers.

- A key development principle is the *two-five rule* which states that anything students are expected to master at a given point should be introduced 2 years prior and explored in at least five different contexts prior to mastery.

- The curriculum also makes use of *structured peer assistance*. Students often work with a partner to explore and solve challenging problems. This greatly increases the amount of time students are actively engaged with mathematics during a typical class period.

- One unique feature is the emphasis the program places on *developing students ability to read, interpret, and verbalize mathematical terms and ideas*. This is a critical life skill often absent in mathematics curriculums.

- Students needing extra help receive an accelerated learning class daily, called *Computer and Team Assisted Mathematics Acceleration*, in addition to their regular math class. Because students only go to this class for one quarter of the year, large number of students in a school can be served each year. Computer and Team Assisted Mathematics Acceleration is not a pullout program so students do not miss the regular math class. It relies upon computer programs to provide targeted instruction to partners who share computers and who take turns answering questions.

What Are The Costs?

The University of Chicago School Mathematics Project curricular materials are commercially published and cost about the same as other commercially available materials. The fifth and sixth grade curriculum uses consumable student books which need to be replaced every year and cost approximately $11 per student. There are also one-time costs for the teacher materials of approximately $175, manipulatives, and some supplemental non-consumable student materials (about $10 per student). The seventh and eighth grade curriculum uses a non-consumable student text which costs about $40 per student.

In addition, schools will need to make an investment in professional development. It is recommended that teachers receive up to 50 hours of professional development during the implementation year and follow-up support in the years to follow.

The costs of running the Computer and Team Assisted Mathematics Acceleration program for 20 students includes the cost of 10 multi-media computers with CD Rom (about $2,000 each if the school does not already have these in a computer lab), the cost of software (about $500), and the cost of a teacher for the period. Professional development for this aspect of the program is usually conducted in conjunction with the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

In order to facilitate and insure the successful implementation and use of the Talent Development Middle School Mathematics program, the program has designed an extensive, focused and multi-tiered professional development and teacher support plan. The plan has two main components.

First, teachers receive up to 50 hours of professional development during the implementation year. A 3-day summer institute in August is followed by monthly 3-hour Saturday sessions and up to 6 additional 2-hour sessions held after school which are scheduled as needed.

The second component of the professional development plan is three tiers of teachers support, described below.

- The first tier is school based. Each middle school in the Talent Development network has a math coordinator and a double dose teacher who receive intensive training in either the fifth- and sixth-grade curriculum, the seventh- and eighth-grade curriculum, or both. These teachers then take an active role in leading parts of the staff development sessions and provide daily support to teachers in their school. After spending a year in apprenticeship, these teachers are able to train new teachers to the school.

- The second tier is a highly skilled teacher (from the district on special assignment to the school) who serves as a full time math facilitator.

- The third, optional, tier of support is provided by university-based researchers. It consists of weekly contact either by phone or in person with the school-based math coordinators or the math facilitator.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

While the Talent Development Middle School Mathematics program has only recently begun to be implemented in a systematic way, there is much evidence to support use of the model. The success of the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project middle school curriculum has been documented in a number of achievement studies. The Middle School Curriculum Review Series has cited the program as a middle school exemplary curriculum sensitive to the needs of urban, educationally disadvantaged students that has "demonstrated success in urban environments.

Most recently, the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project curriculum has been cited as a contributing factor in the success of students in the "First in the World Consortium"—a group of school districts in the Chicago area which voluntarily administered and demonstrated world class success on the eighth grade mathematics exam given as part of the Third International Mathematics and Science Study.

Where Can I See It?

University of Chicago School Mathematics Project materials are currently being used by over three million students nation-wide and hundreds of school districts including Philadelphia,

Minneapolis, Birmingham, and the Bronx. The Talent Development Middle School Mathematics program can be seen at several middle schools in Philadelphia. Contact the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk to learn more about sites where the program is being implemented.

Whom Do I Contact?

Talent Development Middle School Mathematics Program
Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3003 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Telephone: 410–516–8800; Fax: 410–516–8890
E-mail: dmaciver@scov.csos.jhu.edu; Website: http://csos.jhu.edu/crespar/crespar.html

The Research Base

The Talent Development Middle School Math program builds on recent research on alternatives to tracking, and on clear theories of how to foster the positive relationships and supportive conditions that are so important to middle school adolescents, especially those adolescents placed at risk. The model draws on research identifying the essential components of effective middle schools. It provides for a curriculum aimed at active learning in which all students are exposed to a demanding curriculum focusing on higher order competencies and utilizing technologies appropriate to these goals. The Talent Development Middle School Mathematics program employs multi-layered pedagogy which includes flexible use of time and resources to prevent course failures and grade retentions and to nurture students' talents.

Talent Development Middle School
Student Team Literature Program

What Is It?

The Talent Development Middle School Student Team Literature program is a model for teaching reading, English, and language arts in the middle school grades. It changes both the instructional processes and the curriculum in middle grades reading and language arts to create a motivational climate and to further students' reading comprehension and understanding of good literature.

The model couples a demanding, standards-driven curriculum provided to all students in 90 minute heterogeneous classes with an "double dose" computer-based reading/language arts curriculum for those students who need extra help to succeed in reading and language arts. The core Student Team Literature program includes:

- Curriculum materials, consisting of award winning novels and plays;
- Recommended instructional practices, peer assistance processes and assessments; and
- Staff development, mentoring and advising to support the curricular and instructional reforms.

Because of the challenging nature of the curriculum, many students need extra help to succeed. Students needing extra help receive an accelerated learning class in addition to their regular 1 hour reading and language arts class. The *"double dose" class* replaces an elective course or gym for at least one quarter of each year.

How Did It Get Started?

The Talent Development Middle School Student Team Literature program is the reading and language arts component of the Talent Development Middle School whole school reform model. It was first implemented in a Philadelphia middle school serving a significant number of students placed at risk in September 1995. The Student Team Literature program is an elaboration and adaptation of the Student Team Reading program, which provides greater variety in curricular materials, instructional practices and processes aimed at producing more higher level thinking, better comprehension, and preventing monotony. The program is designed to enact the philosophy that all students can learn challenging materials if the right types of supportive environments and conditions are fostered.

How Does It Work?

In the Student Team Literature program, reading instruction is meaningful because students read good literature of high interest to them. The teacher prepares the students to read the book by introducing the author and relevant background material, and introducing new vocabulary words. One of the distinctive features of a Student Team Literature class is the structured and systematic way students work together. Students work in *cooperative learning teams* of four to five students who represent the diversity spectrum of the class in terms of ethnicity, levels or achievement, and gender. They also work with partners, reading to each other, and assessing and supporting each others' learning. Specific activities that students engage in daily include the following.

✎ *Partner Reading and Discussion*

Students read part of a book, first silently, than orally with partners. Oral and repeated reading practice is designed to build fluency, ease in decoding and comprehension. Through the use of partner guides, students are given challenging high-level questions that encourage them to think about and discuss analytically the material they have been reading.

✎ *Story Retelling and Story-Related Essay*

At the end of a book, partners ask each other to summarize the story in their own words. Students are given prompts that require them to respond with a written essay to what they have read. These are followed by peer review, revision, editing and publication.

✎ *Direct Instruction by the Teacher*

The Student Team Literature program also includes daily direct instruction on vocabulary, whole-class discussion of essential points from literature selections, and reading aloud by the teacher to build listening comprehension.

✎ *Computer and Team Assisted Reading, English and Language Arts Acceleration*

Students needing extra help receive an accelerated learning class daily in addition to their regular Student Team Literature class. Because students only go to this class for one quarter of the year, large numbers of students in a school can be served each year. Computer and Team Assisted Reading, English and Language Arts Acceleration is not a pullout program so students do not miss the regular math class. It relies upon computer programs to provide targeted instruction to partners who take turns answering questions.

What Are The Costs?

Costs for Talent Development Student Team Literature program include the costs of novels (if a school is not already using good novels), the cost of the curriculum materials (ranging on average about $150 per classroom of 25 students) and the cost of professional development (average of 5 days per school per year at $800 per day).

The costs of running the Computer and Team Assisted Reading, English and Language Arts Acceleration classroom for 20 students includes the cost of 10 multi-media computers with CD Rom (about $2,000 each if the school does not already have these in a computer lab), the cost of software (about $500), and the cost of a teacher for the period. Professional development for Computer and Team Assisted Acceleration is usually conducted in conjunction with the Student Team Literature program professional development.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Implementation of the Student Team Literature program begins with an initial 2 day professional development session in the summer before the program is implemented. Up to 5 days per year of professional development are delivered by Talent Development trainers on site to teachers at a school.

As the school or school district develops its own cadre of trainers, the training can be done by district or school staff. Modeling of practices by trainers, as well as follow-up coaching and mentoring throughout the year are also part of the implementation of the program. An effective strategy for Student Team Literature implementation is to engage staff of successful, experienced schools in training and follow up in new schools.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Based on preliminary studies that control for prior reading achievement, students in Talent Development Middle School Student Team Literature program classes displayed significantly better reading comprehension after the first year of implementation. Although the impact of participating in the Student Team Literature program on students' reading comprehension is sizable for students across the entire prior achievement spectrum, students with the strongest prior reading skills especially benefit. In addition, peer assistance is more frequent and more productive in Student Team Literature classes than in comparison classes. These findings are based on studies conducted on 21 Talent Development Middle School Student Team Literature classes and 25 comparison classes in a closely matched control school.

Where Can I See It?

The Talent Development Student Team Literature program can be seen at several middle schools in Philadelphia. Contact the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk to learn about sites where the program is being implemented.

Whom Do I Contact?

Talent Development Middle School Student Team Literature Program
Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3003 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Telephone: 410–516–8800; Fax: 410–516–8890
E-mail: dmaciver@scov.csos.jhu.edu; Website: http://csos.jhu.edu/crespar/crespar.html

The Research Base

The Talent Development Middle School Student Team Literature Program has been designed around existing research indicating that in order to create an environment in which every middle school student achieves a high level of intellectual proficiency, four aspects of the social organization of learning need to be improved: the curriculum, instructional and peer assistance strategies, assessment and professional development.

The Student Team Literature curriculum eschews tracking of students, and presents all students in the school with systematic and organized challenging material. The program draws on several instructional strategies that have shown promise in delivering high-level instruction to heterogeneous classrooms, including reciprocal teaching, class-wide peer tutoring, and several variations of cooperative learning. In assessment, the program has instituted a number of innovative classroom assessment approaches in which students provide each other with continual corrective feedback. The model's professional development approach involves all reading and language arts teachers in the school in a focused and collaborative effort to improve teaching and learning. Additionally, continual assistance and follow up is provided throughout the school year.

Professional Development Reform Models

Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Model

What Is It?

Comprehensive school reforms seek to provide schools and districts with sets of principles, guidelines, and materials that teachers and administrators can apply and adapt in order to bring about systemic reform. The Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Model provides guidelines and procedures for the extensive professional development required for the successful implementation and scaling up of the whole-school reforms the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk has developed, including Success for All, Roots and Wings, Talent Development Middle School and Talent Development High School.

Why Did It Get Started?

During the past decade, researchers have been developing comprehensive school reform programs and working with schools across the nation on the implementation and maintenance of the programs. It quickly became apparent that, if comprehensive school reform is to produce results, major changes in the structure of professional development are needed. A number of professional development strategies have been applied and evaluated, and a coherent set of strategies has evolved for helping teachers and administrators develop the commitment and expertise they need to successfully implement comprehensive school reform programs.

How Does It Work?

The primary components of the Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Model include *training materials* to support inservice provision, program-affiliated national *facilitators* who have previous experience in using the program in schools, *local networks* that support the school's implementation, and *a national network* that helps ensure commitment to the program and continuance of the program.

A key to program delivery is the program-affiliated national facilitators. Employed full-time by the program, facilitators are drawn from teachers and school administrators who have been active in implementing and using the program in their schools. They are trained using a buddy system—teamed with a seasoned facilitator to observe training in schools and then to deliver training in schools while being observed. The costs of recruiting and training new facilitators is covered by the program as part of the professional development fees charged to schools and districts.

What Are The Costs?

The cost of professional development for implementing comprehensive school reform will vary according to the size of the school, the materials needed, the components of the program, and the

number of training days required. An estimate of $50,000 to $60,000 during the first year for a school of 500 students would be reasonable. Generally, costs can be covered by Title I, state compensatory, and special education funds in high poverty schools.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

The elements of most comprehensive school reform programs are phased in over a 2- to 3-year period. Implementation through the Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Model incorporates the following elements.

✎ *Awareness*

Schools may become aware of the Comprehensive School Reform Program in a variety of ways, such as articles in educational journals and magazines, presentations at conferences or awareness videos and materials, including books describing the program and its outcomes. Given initial awareness, schools or districts invite program staff to make awareness presentations. Schools also send delegations to visit other schools in their region where the program is being implemented.

✎ *Commitment*

Given interest after awareness activities, comprehensive school reform model program staff visit the district to work out financial and training arrangements and to negotiate an understanding of what the district, school, and program responsibilities will be. The program is then presented to the whole staff of each interested school. Following opportunities to examine materials, visit other schools, and discuss among themselves, school staffs vote by secret ballot to implement the program. This exercise is essential in that it assures teachers that they had a free choice and that the program is supported by the great majority of their colleagues.

✎ *Planning for Implementation*

A national trainer from the Comprehensive School Reform Program staff is appointed to serve as the school's lead contact. A school facilitator is then chosen, usually an experienced and respected teacher from within the school's own staff. The facilitator (and often the principal as well) attend a week-long training session, held well in advance of training for the school staff. This gives the facilitators and principals time to work out issues of staffing, space, finances, and ordering and storing materials.

✎ *Initial Professional Development*

A 2- to 3-day professional development session is provided prior to implementation of the program. This initial development is typically done by the school's lead contact, other staff from

the central program or regional training sites, and staff developers who are facilitators or teachers in existing program schools.

✎ *On-Going On-Site Staff Development and Technical Assistance*

Follow-up visits and continuing staff development are conducted by program facilitators. These facilitators strengthen the skills of the building facilitators by jointly conducting an implementation review in which they visit classes, interview teachers and administrators, and look at student data. The facilitators model ways of giving feedback to teachers, give the building facilitators advice on solving their problems, share perspectives on strengths and weaknesses of the program, and plan with the building facilitator the goals for individual teachers and for general program implementation that the facilitator will follow up on. The facilitators meet with teachers to provide additional training, respond to questions and discuss issues needing further attention.

✎ *Local Support Networks*

Local schools that have successfully implemented a whole school reform professional development program know the details of the program and how to make it work in an environment very similar to that of the new school. Experienced and new schools can establish "mentoring" relationships in which staff exchange visits, materials, and ideas. School-to-school mentoring lets the teachers, facilitators, and principals in successful schools share their wisdom of practice and hard-won experience. It gives new schools an attainable vision of what comprehensive school reform should be like and gives staffs of new schools support when they run into problems or opposition.

Local support networks also sponsor local conferences around the comprehensive school reform program to bring large numbers of local school personnel together to benefit from each other's expertise. Through local networking, staff members from different schools are able to suggest new ways of solving problems or looking at common issues.

✎ *National Network*

Systemic and lasting change is far more likely when schools work together as part of a national network in which they share a common vision and a common language, share ideas and technical assistance, and create an emotional connection and support system. The network, at the least, sponsors an annual conference which offers valuable information on new developments and new ideas; builds connections between the experienced schools so that they can share ideas on issues of common interest and build significant relationships with other schools pursuing similar objectives; issues a communications newsletter and conducts other communications activities; and, in general, seeks to create an esprit de corps, and pride in what has been accomplished through the comprehensive school reform program.

C
P
D

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

Using the Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Model, the Success for All program has found that, in regular follow-up visits, more than 90 percent of teachers in the grades implementing the program are doing an adequate job of implementation. Further, many teachers are using the program materials and methods as a jumping-off point for innovative and exciting instruction.

Where Can I See It?

The model is being used and refined in conjunction with Success for All, Roots and Wings, Talent Development Middle School, and Talent Development High School programs. Contact the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk to visit sites.

Whom Do I Contact?

Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3003 North Charles Street; Suite 200
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
Telephone: 410–516–8800; Fax: 410–516–8890
E-mail: jhollifiel@scov.csos.jhu.edu; Website: http://csos.jhu.edu/crespar/crespar.html

The Research Base

The Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Program builds upon research on effective professional development, implementation of reform, and dissemination practices. Professional development research has long noted the ineffectiveness of "one-shot" workshops in the implementation of effective practices and programs. The research has also noted the ineffectiveness of inspirational style workshops compared to workshops that focus on content, and noted the need for staff development to be conducted by colleagues that teachers relate to and respect. The Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Program provides ongoing, site-based professional development that emphasizes the implementation and use of content-related methods and materials and emphasizes the staff development role of the local school facilitator.

Implementation research has long noted the need for teacher commitment and teacher ownership in the school reform process. The Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Program promotes initial teacher and administrator buy-in through extensive early awareness activities that culminate in a school-wide commitment to implement the comprehensive school reform program. Through local and national networks, teacher-school contributions to the implementation of the program build recognition of teacher efforts and produce ownership.

CULTURES

What Is It?

CULTURES is a university-based in-service professional development model that prepares experienced elementary and middle school teachers to be successful teachers in urban schools. This model is built on the assumption that well-trained, reflective, culturally responsive teachers can make a significant difference in the lives of urban public school children. The CULTURES model provides a supportive, and challenging environment in which experienced teachers can learn to transform their classrooms and schools into effective learning communities for urban poor, immigrant and students of color who have heretofore experienced only school failure.

Why Did It Get Started?

Founded in October 1994, CULTURES was developed as a partnership between the Emory University Division of Educational Studies and several school systems in and around metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia : Atlanta Public Schools, Decatur City Schools, Fulton County Schools, Clayton County Schools, and Dekalb County Schools. CULTURES is a response to the dramatic increase in the number of urban, culturally diverse students—many of whom are poor—and the attendant need to provide their teachers with opportunities for professional growth focussing on the development of knowledge regarding effective instructional strategies and curricula that are pedagogically and culturally responsive to the abilities, experiences, and challenges faced by these children.

How Does It Work?

The professional development activities in CULTURES, focus around cohorts of 15 teachers who work together during 40 hours of intensive inservice training. The professional development activities involve a combination of theory, practices and strategies such as those described below.

- Practices such as classroom discussions, readings, demonstrations, cultural autobiographies, simulations, role-playing, micro-teaching, reflective journal writing, lesson planning, and visits to classrooms of schools that are acknowledged as successful in educating students from diverse backgrounds.

- Cultural immersion strategies including presentations by guest lecturers from the local African-American, Hispanic, and Vietnamese communities; interviews with various residents of students' communities; research into the history of the students' communities; and visits to students' homes, churches, neighborhoods, and cultural centers.

- Development of instructional strategies using cooperative learning, classroom action research projects, learning centers and other instructional methods found to be effective with students with a variety of learning styles and backgrounds.

What Are The Costs?

CULTURES is currently funded through a number of grants and initiatives. Costs vary according to the amount of the stipend that teachers receive.

How Is The Model Implemented In A School?

Teachers are selected through a screening process that includes applications, interviews, and recommendations from staff development administrators, principals, teachers who have previously participated in the program, and community members. Participating teachers are required to enter into a contractual agreement with the university that specifies expectations, requirements, and conditions for participation in the program. The teachers receive a stipend and four staff development credits, and may also enroll for university graduate credit hours.

After completion of an initial 40-hour experience, teachers are encouraged to continue to meet on an on going basis with CULTURES' staff members and their 15 member cohort group. All of the teachers receive a manual to assist them in training other teachers in their school. They are also provided materials and additional assistance from CULTURES upon request.

University schools of education interested in implementing the CULTURES model must consider the need for release time for faculty to provide courses to trainees, space and instructional materials, transportation for school visits and cultural immersion trips, and honoraria for ambassadors and consultants from the various ethnic communities who are invited to make presentations and meet with trainees.

Although this is a professional development program for experienced teachers, most of the components are applicable to preservice teacher education programs.

What Is The Evidence That The Model Is Successful?

An evaluation of the effectiveness of CULTURES was built into the program from its inception. The results of the evaluation which include self report data from a survey administered to participants following program completion as well as the collection of follow up information after participants returned to their schools, suggest that the program has been very successful in meeting the teachers' professional development needs. The data indicate that on a 5-point scale, 94 percent of participants thought that the program was very positive and 6 percent indicated that it was positive. Regarding specific components, the results reveal that teachers

were most positive about the cultural immersion trips, the in-class presentations and discussions, and the guest speakers from the different ethnic communities.

All of the teachers indicate that they plan to use what they learned in their classrooms (greater tolerance and sensitivity toward diverse students, better understanding of diverse learning styles, and some of the instructional methods that can address effectively the different learning styles, such as cooperative learning). Most indicated that they plan to conduct workshops and in service programs for fellow teachers when they return to their schools.

The recommendations most frequently cited were to extend the course over a longer period of time and even develop a CULTURES II course that would extend the work begun in CULTURES I, and also to incorporate more cultural immersions field trips. Clearly, the teachers want to learn more about issues related to teaching diverse students.

Another related indicator of CULTURES' success is the finding that many of the CULTURES' teachers returned to their schools and began to work on school-wide reforms to make their schools more responsive to urban poor and minority students. Over half of the teachers who completed the program, have already presented staff development workshops at their schools, sharing materials and knowledge acquired in CULTURES. Other have developed multicultural resource guides to assist teachers in their schools identify curriculum materials and teaching resources, as well as resources in their local school community that can make the learning experience more relevant and appropriate for urban minority students.

Where Can I See It?

Contact Jacqueline Jordan Irvine at Emory University for dates of upcoming CULTURES' sessions.

Whom Do I Contact?

Jacqueline Jordan Irvine
Emory University, Division of Educational Studies
North Decatur Building, Suite 240
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Telephone: 404–727–0605; Fax: 404–727–2799
E-mail: jirvine@emory.edu; Website: http://www.emory.edu/cultures/

The Research Base

The CULTURES' curriculum connects teachers' classroom experiences with current research and knowledge on culturally, racially, and ethnically diverse learners. CULTURES provides teachers with experiences and training related to five roles that are part of the teaching and

instructional work of a teacher of diverse student groups: culturally responsive pedagogy, systemic school reform, study of the diverse communities from which their students come, reflective teaching, and development of content expertise. Each of these roles is grounded in the core principles of The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and on research on school reform as it relates to urban poor and minority students.

CULTURES incorporates the research base on culturally responsive pedagogy and teaching effectiveness by recognizing that in order to maximize learning opportunities, teachers must gain knowledge of the cultures represented in their classrooms, and then be able to incorporate this knowledge in their instructional practices. CULTURES builds upon the research indicating that in order to develop teachers who can succeed in urban school environments, they must be provided with knowledge of the school change literature, have the opportunity to become part of a professional learning community, and be provided with supports for handling the unique stresses that accompany teaching in urban schools. The critical role teachers play in being able to create caring communities in which all students are valued and believe they can learn, has been demonstrated through research. CULTURES assists teachers change their classrooms into more personalized and caring learning environments.

The research base indicates that teachers must be reflective practitioners with attitudes of open-mindedness and the observational, communication, analytical, and problem-solving skills necessary to continually monitor, evaluate, and revisit their own teaching practices. CULTURES assists teachers examine their actions, instructional practices, and materials against the background of their students' cultural roots and experiences and preferred learning styles.

The curriculum focus of CULTURES attends to the presentation of content in culturally responsive ways, and also emphasizes discipline-specific standards such as the standards outlined by National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Standards Project for English Language Arts, Geography Standards Project, and the content-specific standards developed by The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Appendix A:

Models Grouped by Center/Program Affiliation, Grade Levels and Educational Priorities

Appendix A

Appendix A groups the models according to three different subject categories. First, the models are grouped according to the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students research program or center with which they are affiliated. Second, the models are listed according to the grade levels upon which they focus. Lastly, a cross referencing system matches each model with specific educational priorities which research has shown are important in improving achievement for students placed at risk. A table depicting the cross referencing system also is included.

Center/Program Affiliation

The research centers and programs through which the 27 models have received support, listed below, are described in appendix B with two exceptions: the National Center on Education in the Inner Cities which no longer exists, and the Fund for the Improvement of Education which is primarily administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement's Office of Reform Assistance and Dissemination.

Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence

> Advancement Via Individual Determination; Consensus Standards Model; Linking Home and School: A BRIDGE to the Many Faces of Mathematics; Native American Instructional Programs: Standards for Effective Pedagogy; School Change Model: Basic Principles for School Reform in a Bilingual Context; Three-Year Transition Program for Native Spanish-Speaking Elementary Students; Two-Way Immersion Education

Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk

> Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Model; Éxito Para Todos; National Network of Partnership Schools; Roots and Wings; Success for All; Talent Development High School; Talent Development Middle School; Talent Development Middle School Mathematics Program; Talent Development Middle School Student Team Literature Program; Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

National Center on Education in the Inner Cities[1]

> Adaptive Learning Environments Model; 20/20 Analysis: A Tool for Instructional Planning; Community for Learning; Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline

---

[1]This Center is no longer funded by NIEARS. Community for Learning, Adaptive Learning Environments Model, and 20/20 Analysis: A Tool for Instructional Planning currently are receiving support from the Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory.

The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented

Curriculum Compacting; Enrichment Clusters; Schoolwide Enrichment Model

Field Initiated Studies

Urban Learner Framework

Fund for the Improvement of Education

CULTURES

Grade Level Focus

Prekindergarten–12th grade

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; 20/20 Analysis: A Tool for Instructional Planning; Community for Learning; Comprehensive School Reform Professional Development Model; Consensus Standards Model; Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline; Curriculum Compacting; Enrichment Clusters; National Network of Partnership Schools; Native American Instructional Programs: Standards for Effective Pedagogy; Schoolwide Enrichment Model; Urban Learner Framework

Elementary

Éxito Para Todos; Roots and Wings; School Change Model: Basic Principles for School Reform in a Bilingual Context; Success for All; Two Way Immersion; Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

First–third grade

Three-Year Transition Program for Spanish-Speaking Elementary Students

Middle school

Advancement Via Individual Determination; Talent Development Middle School

High school

Advancement Via Individual Determination; Talent Development High School

Educational Priorities

Afterschool Program

Community for Learning; Families and Schools Together; National Network of Partnership Schools; Roots and Wings; Talent Development High School

Assessment

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; 20/20 Analysis: A Tool for Instructional Planning; Community for Learning; Curriculum Compacting; Éxito Para Todos; Roots and Wings; School Change Model: Basic Principles for School Reform in a Bilingual Context; Schoolwide Enrichment Model; Success for All; Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

Block Scheduling

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Community for Learning; Talent Development High School; Talent Development Middle School; Talent Development Middle School Mathematics Program; Talent Development Middle School Student Team Literature Program; Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

Community/Business Partnerships

Community for Learning; Families and Schools Together; National Network for Partnership Schools; Talent Development High School

Cooperative Learning

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Advancement Via Individual Determination; Community for Learning; Consensus Standards Model; Éxito Para Todos; Native American Instructional Programs: Standards for Effective Pedagogy; Success for All; Roots and Wings; Talent Development Middle School; Talent Development High School; Two-Way Immersion Education

Cultural Diversity

Advancement Via Individual Determination; Consensus Standards Model; CULTURES; Éxito Para Todos; Families and Schools Together; Native American Instructional Programs: Standards for Effective Pedagogy; School Change Model: Basic Principles for School Reform in a Bilingual Context; Three-Year Transition Program for Native Spanish-Speaking Elementary Students; Two-Way Immersion Education; Urban Learner Framework

Discipline

Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline; Families and Schools Together; Talent Development High School

Extra Help/Tutoring

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Advancement Via Individual Determination; 20/20 Analysis: A Tool for Instructional Planning; Community for Learning; Éxito Para Todos; Families and Schools Together; Roots and Wings; Schoolwide Enrichment Model; Success for All; Talent Development High School; Talent Development Middle School; Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

Individualized Instruction

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; 20/20 Analysis: A Tool for Instructional Planning; Community for Learning; Curriculum Compacting; Schoolwide Enrichment Model

Learning Centers

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Community for Learning; Consensus Standards Model; Families and Schools Together; Native American Instructional Program: Standards for Effective Pedagogy; Talent Development High School

Mathematics

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Community for Learning; Linking Home and School: A BRIDGE to the Many Faces of Mathematics; Roots and Wings; Talent Development Middle School; Talent Development Middle School Mathematics Program

Parent Involvement

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Advancement Via Individual Determination; Community for Learning; Éxito Para Todos; Families and Schools Together; National Network of Partnership Schools; Roots and Wings; Success for All; Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

Project Learning

Enrichment Clusters; Schoolwide Enrichment Model; Roots and Wings

Reading

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Community for Learning; Éxito Para Todos; Roots and Wings; Success for All; Talent Development Middle School; Talent Development Middle School Student Team Literature; Talent Development High School; Three-Year Transition Program for Native Spanish-Speaking Elementary Students; Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

School to Work/Career Education

Advancement Via Individual Determination; Enrichment Clusters; Talent Development High School; Talent Development Middle School

School-Linked Health and Human Services

Community for Learning; Éxito Para Todos; Families and Schools Together; National Network of Partnership Schools; Roots and Wings; Success for All; Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

Science/Social Studies

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Community for Learning; Roots and Wings

Second Language Learning/Bilingual Education

Consensus Standards Model; Éxito Para Todos; Families and Schools Together; Native American Instructional Programs: Standards for Effective Pedagogy; Roots and Wings; School Change Model: Basic Principles for School Reform in a Bilingual Context; Success for All; Three-Year Transition Program for Native Spanish-Speaking Elementary Students; Two Way Immersion Education

Social Skills

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Community for Learning; Advancement Via Individual Determination; Consistency Management & Cooperative Discipline; Éxito Para Todos; Families and Schools Together; Roots and Wings; Success for All; Urban School Development: Literacy as a Lever for Change

Special Education

Adaptive Learning Environments Model; Community for Learning; Éxito Para Todos; Families and Schools Together; Roots and Wings; Success for All

Families and Schools Together; Talent Development High School; Talent Development Middle School; Three-Year Transition Program for Native Spanish-Speaking Elementary Students

Table of School Reform Models, by Educational Priorities

Comprehensive School Reform Models																		
	20/20	AVID	CFL	CSM	CMCD	EPT	NNPS	NAIP	R&W	SCM	SEM	SFA	TDHS	TDMS	3YR	2WAY	ULF	USD
Afterschool Program			X						X				X					
Assessment	X		X			X			X	X	X	X		X	X			X
Block Scheduling			X										X	X				X
Community/Business Partnerships			X				X						X					
Cooperative Learning		X	X	X		X		X	X			X	X	X		X		
Cultural Diversity		X		X		X		X		X					X	X	X	
Discipline					X								X					
Extra Help/Tutoring	X	X	X			X			X		X	X	X	X				X
Individualized Instruction	X		X								X							
Learning Centers			X	X				X					X					
Mathematics			X						X					X				
Parent Involvement		X	X			X	X		X			X						X
Project Learning									X		X							
Reading			X			X			X			X	X	X	X			X
School to Work/Career Ed		X											X	X				
School-Linked Health and Human Services			X			X	X		X			X						X
Science/Social Studies			X						X					X				
Second Language Learning/Bilingual Education				X		X		X	X	X		X			X	X		
Social Skills		X	X		X	X			X			X						X
Special Education			X			X			X			X						
Transitions							X						X	X	X			

Table of School Reform Models, by Educational Priorities, continued

	Classroom and Curriculum Redesign Models							Professional Development Reform Models	
	ALEM	CURC	ENRICH	FAST	BRIDGE	TDMM	TDML	CPD	CULTURES
Afterschool Program				X					
Assessment	X	X				X	X		
Block Scheduling	X					X	X		
Community/Business Partnerships				X					
Cooperative Learning	X					X	X		
Cultural Diversity				X	X				X
Discipline				X					
Extra Help/Tutoring	X			X		X	X		
Individualized Instruction	X	X							
Learning Centers	X			X					
Mathematics	X				X	X			
Parent Involvement	X		X	X	X				
Project Learning			X						
Reading	X						X		
School to Work/Career Ed			X						
School-Linked Health and Human Services				X					
Science/Social Studies	X								
Second Language Learning/ Bilingual Education				X					
Social Skills	X			X					
Special Education	X			X					
Transitions			X	X					

Appendix B:

Information on the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students and Its Mission, Program and Staff

The National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students

The National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students was created in the U.S. Department of Education by the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination and Improvement Act of 1994. The Institute's purpose is to "carry out a coordinated and comprehensive program of research and development" for the improvement of the education of "at-risk students" (Sec. 931(e)(2)). The statute defines an "at-risk student" as one who "because of limited English proficiency, poverty, race, geographic location, or economic disadvantage, faces a greater risk of low educational achievement or reduced academic expectations" (Sec. 912(l)(2)).

The mission of this Institute is to provide national leadership and support to expand research- based knowledge and strategies that promote excellence and equity in the education of children and youth placed at risk of educational failure. The legislation authorizes the Institute to:

- manage grants to operate national research and development centers;
- conduct research directly and through contracts;
- support field-initiated studies;
- provide technical assistance to practitioners;
- create a senior fellows program in the Institute; and
- award dissertation grants and fellowships to support graduate study by minorities.

Research and Development Centers — A major component of the Institute is the National Research and Development Center program:

- **Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.** Co-directed by the Johns Hopkins University and Howard University, this Center focuses on how schools, families and community agencies can work together to ensure that students placed at risk of educational failure achieve their full potential throughout their schooling and beyond. Three themes underlie the work of the Center: ensuring success at key points in children's development and schooling, building on personal and cultural assets, and scaling up successful programs. *Telephone:* 410-516-8808. *Fax:* 410-516-8890. *WWW site:* http://scov.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/crespar.html *Institute staff contact:* Oliver Moles.

- **National Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence.** This Center, located at the University of California at Santa Cruz, conducts research to assist the nation's population of diverse students, including those at risk of educational failure, to achieve to high standards. The work is divided into five central programs: language learning; professional development; family, peers, school, and community; teaching and learning in context; and integrated reform. *Telephone:* 408-459-3500. *Fax:* 408-459-3502. *WWW site:* http://www.cal.org/crede/ *Institute staff contact:* Gilbert Garcia.

- **National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.** This Center, located at the University of Connecticut at Storrs, is a collaborative effort among five universities. The work of the Center is focused on identification and programming issues for students who may not be identified as gifted and talented through traditional assessment methods. Emphasis is placed on a broadened conception of giftedness that recognizes the importance of developing high levels of performance using the strategies developed in gifted education research to impact total school improvement for all students. *Telephone:* 860-486-5401. *Fax:* 860-486-2900. *WWW site:* http://www.gifted.uconn.edu *Institute staff contact:* Beverly Coleman.

For More Information:
Write, fax, call or visit our website

The National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students
U S Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, D C 20208-5521
Telephone (202) 219-2239
Fax (202) 219-2030
http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/At-Risk/

Edward Fuentes, Director
Telephone (202) 219-2239
E-mail edward_fuentes@ed.gov

Frances Clark
Telephone (202) 219-2239
E-mail frances_clark@ed.gov

Beverly Coleman
Telephone (202) 219-2280
E-mail beverly_coleman@ed.gov

Stephanie Dalton
Telephone (202) 208-2497
E-mail stephanie_ dalton@ed.gov

Beth Fine
Telephone (202) 219-1323
E-mail beth_fine@ed.gov

Kathy FitzGerald
Telephone (202) 219-1468
E-mail kathy_fitzgerald@ed.gov

Gilbert Garcia
Telephone (202) 219-2144
E-mail gil_garcia@ed.gov

Susanne Hough
Telephone (202) 208-4008
E-mail susanne_hough@ed.gov

Jerome Lord
Telephone (202) 219-2242
E-mail jerome_lord@ed.gov

Holly Martinez
Telephone (202) 219-2024
E-mail debra_hollinger-martinez@ed.gov

Charlene Medley
Telephone (202) 219-2037
E-mail charlene_medley@ed.gov

Oliver Moles
Telephone (202) 219-2211
E-mail oliver_moles@ed.gov

Ok-Choon Park
Telephone (202) 208-3951
E-mail ok-choon_park@ed.gov

Ronald Pedone
Telephone (202) 219-2247
E-mail ronald_pedone@ed gov

Sandra Steed
Telephone (202) 219-2197
E-mail sandra_steed@ed.gov

Karen Suagee
Telephone (202) 219-2244
E-mail karen_suagee@ed.gov

Susan Talley
Telephone (202) 219-2129
E-mail susan_talley@ed.gov

Sponsored Research — The National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students is co-sponsoring two studies on **Developing and Implementing High Performance Learning Communities**. The five year studies focus on the strategies and procedures to initiate, support, and sustain high achievement for all students, especially those students in high poverty schools. *Staff contact:* Kathy FitzGerald.

The institute also is co-sponsoring a **Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching** that will bring together elementary, secondary and postsecondary educational institutions, state and local education entities, national professional associations and other stakeholders across this nation whose influence is crucial to improving teaching effectiveness. This new Partnership, headed by the University of Maryland, aims to enable those who teach and influence teaching to use knowledge based on research and effective practice to ensure that teachers have the capabilities, motivation, and opportunity to help all students, especially those placed at risk of educational failure, achieve challenging academic standards. *Staff contacts:* Edward Fuentes and Stephanie Dalton.

Field-Initiated Studies Research Grants — The Field-Initiated Studies Program supports work to improve the education of students placed at risk of educational failure by awarding multi-year discretionary research grants on topics generated by investigators from a variety of entities. The institute funded 15 projects in 1996 and six additional awards in 1997. Check the Field-Initiated Studies Internet site at http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/FIS/ for more details and information about future competitions. *Staff contacts:* Beth Fine and Karen Suagee.

Small Business Innovation Research Program — This program funds research to stimulate technological innovation in the private sector, strengthen the role of small business in meeting Federal research and development needs, and increase the commercial application of ED-supported research results. In 1997, this Institute made seven awards under the following topic: Development or Adaptation of Innovative Technologies to Enhance Learning and Development of Students Placed At Risk of Educational Failure. *Staff contact:* Ok-Choon Park.

The D.C. Desk — A key component of the Department's Washington, D.C. Public Schools Initiative, the D.C. Desk provides access to Department resources for key personnel in the D.C. Public Schools. The D.C. Desk is actively involved in support of the school system's systemic reform efforts through activities such as technical assistance related to research-based practices and information, and linkages to promising school reform initiatives. *Staff contacts:* Susan Talley, Sandra Steed, and Ronald Pedone.

Visiting Scholars Fellowships — This institute has joined with other Office of Educational Research and Improvement institutes to establish a visiting scholar program, administered by the National Research Council. The fellowships will provide an opportunity for the most qualified applicants to work at the institutes in Washington, D.C. for a specified amount of time. More information is available from the National Research Council on the Internet at http://fellowships.nas.edu or by telephone at (202) 334-2872. *Staff contact:* Sandra Steed.

Graduate Research Fellowships and Dissertation Grants — The Institute has an agreement with the National Center for Education Statistics and the National Science Foundation to further support ongoing joint grant programs administered through the American Educational Research Association. The institute's contributions to the grants program are intended to support research by minority students and will be awarded to conduct large-scale policy and practice related education research on issues pertinent to the mission of the National Institute on the Education of At-Risk Students. *Staff contact:* Edward Fuentes.

United States
Department of Education
Washington, DC 20208–5521

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use, $300

Postage and Fees Paid
U.S. Department of Education
Permit No. G–17

Standard Mail (B)

AR 98–7101

HV1626 N213 T617
TOOLS FOR SCHOOLS

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME